

# THE CALCUTTA JOURNAL.

OF

## Politics and General Literature.

VI.]

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1822

[No. 291.]

### SUMMARY OF NEWS.

— 465 —

#### Politics of Europe.

*Influence of the Crown.*—It seems curious that every motion made in the House of Commons, which goes to recognize the existence of whatever infirmity or imperfection may have crept into the character of that illustrious body, is not merely liable to be defeated because what it alleges is true, but that the mover of the proposition may predict his own discomfiture, with a degree of certainty in exact proportion to that of the truth which he affirms. For instance, now, we will suppose it a disputable assertion, and one upon the justice of which conscientious men in society may be about equally divided, that "the House of Commons, according to its actual constitution, does not fully represent the people." If a resolution were offered to the House in such terms, and if Members of Parliament, partaking the diversity of opinion which prevailed out of doors, were by their votes to give a fair expression to their sentiments upon that resolution, we should probably find a trifling majority on either side of the question. If, on the other hand, we could imagine it to be clear and notorious, that the majority of the House of Commons did not represent the people, but were launched into that assembly by Ministers and Peers, not to deliberate upon any subject, but to vote as they were commanded, upon all; to defend frauds—to brand themselves with falsehoods, as that 2 was equal to 5, or 20s. to 27s., and so forth;—if, we say, the majority of the House of Commons were thus strangely composed, and the proposition which we have quoted above were presented to them, it is quite plain how the different classes of Members would vote—that is to say, the honest men in the House would feel bound to adopt the proposition, while the others—viz. those who had the most intimate conviction of its truth—those who were in their own persons the very evidences of that truth—those whose existence as Members of Parliament was the immediate and direct consequence of its undeniable veracity—would to a man give their votes against it, and declare that no such thing was ever heard of as the unconstitutional return of a Member of Parliament. In precisely the same way it is, that the more extensive and despotic power the Minister exercises over the Members of the House of Commons, the greater will be the number of these gentlemen ready to vote, at his bidding, that he has no influence at all. So, on Mr. Brougham's resolution on Monday night, that "the influence now possessed by the Crown is destructive of the independence of Parliament," by that new but infallible mode of proof which we have been describing, the majority that virtually negated the proposition was nothing more than an evidence in support of it—nobody, unfortunately, believing one whit the more, by reason of the large majority against Mr. Brougham, that the influence of the Crown is not enormous, and destructive in a great measure of the end and use of Parliament: but every sober-minded man lamenting, that the fact alleged by the learned mover had received so striking a confirmation from the 216 voters, who were hardy enough to refuse it their support. Now this vicious perversion of a powerful instrument will prove in the long run, as it ought to do, a serious injury to those who have contrived it. When some noble secretary shall attempt hereafter to throw the odium of his unworthy measures upon Parliament, and to take refuge, as is done every day, in the exclamation, "Oh, what right have you to abuse my

warlike expeditions, or my financial paradoxes? Go and scold Parliament, which adopted them one after the other." Is it not a matter to be well weighed by any Minister who looks forward to enjoying high office, and the fruits of it, during (probably) his whole natural existence, that he thus continually undermines his own resources, and betrays a subterfuge wherever he offers a defence? When he multiplies his appeals for protection to Parliament, and invokes the memory of its repeated concurrence in his most blundering and ruinous schemes, is it not obvious that people will at last retort upon him—"Why shelter yourself under the iniquity of the Walcheren House of Commons—it was your own slave; or of the 20-equal-to-27-shilling House of Commons—it was you who paid it for hacking you in that stupendous effrontery; or, more lately, of the non-reforming House of Commons—for it was you who bribed it to asseverate its own virtue; or of the Crown-influence-denying House of Commons—since the appalling force and magnitude of that influence was demonstrated by the success of your own proposition for passing to the order of the day?"

We conceive Mr. Brougham's speech on Monday to have been beyond all comparison the ablest parliamentary effort of this year; and, with one exception, the debate and division of that day to have been the most valuable of all the proceedings in Parliament for many preceding sessions. The exception we make is in favour of the discussion on Lord John Russell's motion for a gradual reform of Parliament. Both these motions went to the root of things; the first to render the House of Commons less susceptible of corruption; the second (Mr. Brougham's,) to place temptation as far as possible beyond its reach: one endeavouring to fortify the connexion of the representative body with the people, the other to detach it from an undue confederacy with the Executive Government. Both the noble Lord and the learned Gentleman enforced their respective proposals to Parliament, by novel and powerful illustrations of the nature of the grievances to be redressed; and here, too, there was much worth notice in the analogous courses of argument and inference by which these motions were severally supported. Lord John Russell proved the diminution of the popular interest in the House of Commons, as compared with the rights of the people to even an augmentation of that interest, by exhibiting the extraordinary advances of the nation in intellectual acquirements and in positive numbers; as he further established the superiority of that part of the representation in which counties and populous cities had a share, over the mere delegates of Ministers or close boroughs, by tracing the proportions of each class which had voted for or against the country on many great crises during a number of years.

Mr. Brougham arrived at a contiguous point by nearly an opposite avenue, proving the multitude means of corruption which had latterly accrued to the King's Ministers by the immense increase of the public debt, and the complicated patronage in the revenue—the colonies—the army—navy—nor least of all, the power of infliction or alleviation of punishment exercised over the whole of the trading world by Ministers, from the multiplicity, the ubiquity, the lurking treachery, and inevitable activity of the laws by which the revenue is on every side enforced and protected; nor were instances wanting of the practical influence upon the votes of Parliament produced by this amazing

growth of Ministerial power. The alternate devotion to, and desertion of Messrs. Pitt, Addington, Fox, Perceval, &c., by their dear friends, the dead majorities in the House of Commons, as each of these Ministers chanced to be in or out of office, were exhibited by Mr. Brougham in a light which nothing but a continuance of the same system, which, as a matter of history, he was teaching all future generations to reprobate, could have prevented from flashing some transient gleam of virtuous resolution on his hearers. In truth, we are scarcely grieved at the defeat of this memorable motion—to say we are surprised, would be hypocrisy; but, constituted as is the present majority in Parliament, it is a solid gain for the people that such statements should circulate as were brought forward by Mr. Brougham; nor is it a trifling good that the effect produced by them upon the public mind, and by their unsuccessful result, so far as concerned the division of Monday, will infallibly, if not through any definite or formal medium, reach hereafter the better feelings of that assembly by which they have now been undervalued.—*Times, June 26.*

### Imperial Parliament.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MONDAY, JUNE 24, 1822.

#### INFLUENCE OF THE CROWN.

MR. BROUGHAM rose pursuant to his notice. He said that for the last six years, that House had been most laboriously, he trusted not altogether unprofitably, employed, though he felt it might have exerted itself more beneficially, in endeavours to reduce the immense and overflowing expenditure of the country. The principle which influenced the greater portion of these endeavours, was to reduce that expenditure, inasmuch as it weighed with such an overwhelming pressure on the industry of the country. It was not unnatural that under the wide-spread and almost unbearable pressure which that overgrown expenditure had placed upon the country, that the attention of those who suffered should be fixed on those establishments, and that both the country and the House of Commons should view the subject in that light, which more immediately affected the happiness, and seek relief in the first instance in the diminution of the expense. Now by any means inclined to undervalue the efforts which were the result of such natural feelings, and with no disposition to cast blame either on that House, which applied its considerations to that object, or on the people who had chiefly guided its attention to the enormous pressure of our establishments, he, nevertheless, thought he should ill discharge his duty, and in no degree demonstrate those sound and constitutional views which were wont to actuate their ancestors in that House, if he had allowed that Session to close without calling their attention to those establishments under a different view—without advert- ing to them, not alone as establishments existing on such a scale, but with a more permanent influence. As establishments deranging the balance of the Constitution, and diminishing in a very considerable degree the influence of the people in the House of Commons, and in the proportion that they impaired that influence, invalidating the means of preventing those abuses, which it had been in better times the duty and the effort of that House to abridge. It was to supply the defect, the only defect chargeable to that side of the House, that he was induced to give that notice of motion, the merits of which he then rose to discuss. And, in the first place, he should at once ask to have read from their journal, the Resolution of the 6th of April, 1780, did he not know that that resolution most strike the recollection of every Gentleman when he adverted to the notice of motion which was about to be submitted to their consideration. He should proceed, therefore, immediately, to a comparative view of the establishments of the country as they existed at the present period, and as they existed at that time when a resolution of that House recorded, that the influence of the Crown had increased, was increasing, and ought to be diminished. If, then at that period, so far back as the year 1780, reasons existed of such importance as to call from our ancestors such a memorable resolution, with what force does the apprehension that now exists as to the injurious effects of the overwhelming influence of the Crown, call upon them to act upon that example which in the best times of the country was given by our ancestors? He knew he should be met with an objection which had been not unfrequently opposed to those who on any occasion adverted to the growing influence of the Crown. What, it was asked, was it to be believed that the Gentlemen of the opposite side were so unmindful of what was due to their own character and to their country, to vote merely for the circumstance of their holding a place or a pension, differently from what they should have voted had they not held either? Was it to be presumed that the consideration of place, emolument, and power, from the first in importance to the last in influence, the mere enjoyment of fame, still including between the two extremes the more sordid and more solid indulgence of avarice,—that

those considerations were to influence public men? Had they no consciences, that they were to be thus proscribed as the votaries of wretched self and tinsel fame? Were they to be viewed as excluded from all those generous and patriotic emotions which had such a hold on the minds of the best men, and which were not excluded from the feelings of the humblest men, even in the arrangement of their ordinary vestry duties? In the discharge of his Parliamentary duty, he should not violate that regulation of the House which forbade any man to impute improper motives to its Members; with the private character and personal conduct of any Member he had no concern. He had a duty, however, to discharge, and that he should not shrink from performing. He must be allowed to say, that it was the character of placemen to lean towards those who had given them the places—that pensioners looked to the source of their pensions—that in the eye of the Constitution they are objects of distrust—and that the principles of the law and the usages of Parliament proscribed placemen and pensioners, because they are placemen and pensioners. (*hear.*) Such was the language of Parliament in the best times of the Constitution, undisputed by any statesman that ever presided over the destinies of the empire, until within these last five or six years; indeed, acknowledged by every public man, who had been taught to view the power of the Crown, when exercised by giving offices to Members of that House, as an object of jealousy and distrust, at variance with every constitutional principle, to be watched in the conduct of those to whom those favours were dispensed, whose principles were to be counteracted, and whose numbers it was the duty of that House to endeavour to diminish. In opposition to the squeamish and lascivious language which was held on such subjects at the present day, he should call their attention to the Resolutions of that House and the Statutes of Parliament,—he should do so with the hope of having the memory of the House refreshed on that subject, in these degenerate times. After the memorable resolution of April, 1780, Parliament had ordered a yearly Return of the Amount of Monies paid to Members of that House. That Return was expressly called for with the view of securing the purity of that House, and preserving its independence.—What, then, did such conduct on the part of the House of Commons prove? It proved that through these placemen and pensioners existing in that House, our ancestors felt that its purity was blemished, and its independence attacked. By the Act of the 22d of Geo. III., contractors were excluded from seats in that House. What was the meaning of that enactment? What language did it speak as to the influence of the Crown within those walls? It spoke thus:—"You contractors," said the Act, "as I say, you placemen and pensioners; it is impossible that you can vote unbiassed by that influence which the Crown holds over you, in consequence of the favour which, through its bounty, you enjoy. Your conduct in Parliament is to be viewed with distrust and jealousy in the proportion of that influence which these places and pensions give to the Government over the proceedings of this House." In confirmation of this doctrine, he should refer to the Act of Settlement, in which was inserted that well known resolution which precluded, after the accession of the House of Brunswick, placemen and pensioners from sitting in that House. It was true that this Act, so far as adverted to this provision, was repealed in the reign of Anne; but in George the First, the provision was restored, so far as it affected the exclusion of pensioners for a number of years, with the express view of securing the honour of the House of Commons, and of guarding against the former law being evaded by its Members. In 1693 the two Houses of Parliament concurred in passing a Place Bill, but their object being defeated by the refusal of the Royal Assent, the House of Commons resolved, that whoever advised their Majesties to refuse their assent to that Bill, which had for its object to redress a public grievance, and take off a scandal from that House, was an enemy to their Majesties. Here, then, was a proof of the feeling and doctrine of the great men of the Revolution, who, instead of the overweening fastidiousness of this day, recorded in a Parliamentary Resolution, that the man who opposed a Place Bill was an enemy to the Crown; that the holding of places and pensions by Members was a grievance that ought to be redressed; that it was injurious to its independence; and that their exclusion took off a scandal from that House. Having thus shewn what were the feelings and conduct of the greatest men in the best periods of our history, and in so doing having justified his title to the course he was pursuing, he could not proceed to express his views on the consideration of that House better than by entering into a comparative consideration of the establishments as they existed in 1780, when the House of Commons passed its memorable resolution as to the increased influence of the Crown, and the enormous increase of the expenditure and revenue as it existed at present. In 1780, the whole of the Civil List did not exceed 1,130,000*l.* in the midst of an expensive warfare; yet, allowing 3,500,000*l.* for Ireland, the whole of our expenditure at that period, including army and navy, debt and interest, amounted to 18,600,000*l.* He would not go into the details of our expenditure at the present time; they had been so thoroughly discussed during the present Session, that all he should say, was, that with the expenditure, and debt, and management, the whole amounted to 27,000,000*l.* That was the amount of our immediate Home Establishments. From the papers before the House, it did appear, that from

the Colonies of Malta, Ceylon, Trinidad, and the Ionian Islands, a revenue of 900,000*l.* was received. Taking into account what was received from other of the conquered colonies, he might add, under the head of Colonies, one million, to the account of our expenditure, and take the total at 28,000,000*l.* The first thing that would naturally strike the House in this comparison was, that he was contrasting an expensive war establishment in 1780, with a peace establishment in 1822. (*hear.*) But when that memorable Resolution in 1780 was passed by the House of Commons, they never contemplated a war expenditure; they fixed the property on the permanent influence of the Crown, when the expenditure of the country did not exceed 7,000,000*l.* Compare that expenditure with the 28 millions of the present period, and the House would then see what a considerable increase had been made to the number of individuals having employments under the Government. If therefore, the power of the Crown influencing the decisions of that House, was excessive under an expenditure of seven millions, how much more overwhelming must it be under an expenditure of twenty-eight millions? He admitted that the same amount of money did not operate at the present day so powerfully as in 1780. Allowing for the difference in the value, he would consider 2*l.* now as equal to 1*l.* then. That, on an expenditure of 28 millions, would give an increase of establishments fourfold as to the nominal amount, and two-fold on the allowance of the difference in the operation of money. In the American war, the amount of the military force was 35,000, exclusive of those subsidiary supplies which we hired from so many of the petty Powers of Germany. These foreign reinforcements could not be comprehended within that domestic military force, officered by persons, themselves subjects of this country, and connected with so many distinguished families. In 1780, the number of military officers on full and half-pay were 2,000, at present they were 19,000. During the American War, the number of naval officers was 1,500—they amounted at present to 5 or 600 men on full pay, and to 7 or 800 on half pay. Taking the whole of the full and half pay of the respective periods into account, the return of officers in 1780 was 3,800 whilst we had at present a return which reached to the large amount of 27,000. (*hear, hear.*) Was there no increase of patronage, in having the hopes and fears of such a body dependent on the Executive Government? Was there no ground of apprehension too, for the independence of the House of Commons when so many thousand gentlemen either on half-pay looking for employment or on full pay seeking for promotion, were carried to the account of the influence of the Crown? Had he not a right to ask whether a Government holding such an influence over a body of Gentlemen, connected with families of the first distinction, many of themselves holding seats in that House, called upon, possibly, to decide on the conduct of that Government in cashiering brother officers without trial or investigation, who were left to no other mode of redress, but what is offered them by the paltry and vague control of the superintendence of that House: composed as it was of those very officers, who, if they refused their voice to the authors of that severity, would themselves experience a similar exertion of its power? To hold in subservience the hopes and fears of such a class of Gentlemen, so connected, so influenced was it or could it be safe to the Constitution. He should next call the attention of the House to another branch of the question, as it was affected by the increase of our colonies. Since 1780, we had an increase of 19 colonies; but, stating the argument in such a manner as left no ground for dispute, he should take the number of newly acquired colonies at twelve, that being the number we had permanently acquired since 1793.—He had not included in this statement any part of that most important branch of the military establishment, the Staff Appointments. In looking merely to the staff appointments in the Colonies, and not in the empire at large, he found that there had been added since the period in question, in the Colonies alone, 149 or 150 staff appointments, or that number of places for the Government to give away. The civil patronage was increased in proportion. In the six colonies of which we had accurate returns since 1791, the civil places amount to 506. If the increase since 1780 of the civil and military, exclusive of the common regimental appointments, were added, the number would be about 800 places which were at the disposal of the Crown in one single branch, and which made but an accession to the Colonial Department, independent of all other increase, in the superintendence of the revenue, and the auditing the accounts of the respective establishment, which ramified itself into so many branches of official situations—collectors, comptrollers, deputy-comptrollers, clerkships, messengers, &c. numerous beyond all which he had stated, and comprehending all sorts of appointments from the highest to the lowest, and, independent of all which he might say, formed the trunk of the system, the growth of which was now under consideration. This one branch—this offset, was placed at the uncontrollable, unexamined, and unexaminable direction of the Ministers of the Crown—(*hear, hear.*)—which afforded tempting opportunities to all who held, or were desirous of exercising political influence in the distribution of 800 employments. Now if a comparison were drawn in 1780 of the increase of the patronage of the Crown, in the collection of the revenue in our Western and Eastern Empire, ex-

clusive of the dominion of the East India Company in 1780, and of any previous time, suppose 1630, the whole at that former period would shrink into nothing contrasted with this one item—the measure of the increase of the colonial patronage since 1780. For if they looked at the old colonies, at Barbadoes and Jamaica, for instance, they would find nothing to be compared with the enormous sum now stated. Now he stated this without including the patronage of the East India Company, which was very peculiarly circumstanced; for though the Company had the nominal, there was no doubt the Government had the substantial patronage. This must appear manifest, when they considered the good understanding between that body and the Ministers of the Crown—when they looked back to the state of things in 1786, and observed that a great change had taken place in the constitution of the East India Company since 1793, in consequence of which they were now more under the control of Government than at the close of the American war. When they looked to these matters, they would be convinced that the consideration of the interests of the East India Company was not indifferent to the present question—the increase of the patronage of the Crown. He had an average of the proportion of appointments for three years before 1792, and the average proportion of cadetships, writerships, assistant-surgeonships, &c. which for that three years was 132, but in the year 1820 alone they amounted to 527. All these places might be considered under the indirect influence of Government, when they considered the connection between the Company and the Ministers, and when they felt assured that no person to whom Government objected was likely to succeed to an appointment. But he would now state the direct influence of the Crown on this subject. In this one department the Government were allowed one-fourteenth of the patronage, equal to that of two Directorships, or to the shares of the Chairman and Deputy Chairman. He believed this would constitute about nine places in the year before 1793, but now it made 38 or 39, or was fourfold what it had been. But in 1791, and still less in 1780, did any direct influence belong to Government. They had then no fourteenth share—that arrangement had arisen since, and brought a most valuable addition to the patronage of the Crown. Now these 38 places, compared with the 800, would appear moderate, but they were not insignificant, and he begged the attention of the House to the fact of this vast increase of influence. In simple arithmetic those places added together appeared to be 838, but they must be reckoned at much more when the distinction was drawn between places to be filled up yearly and those which were to be filled up generally; thirty-eight vacancies of the former kind at the disposal of Government became equal to a much greater number of the latter description. He would suppose that of places generally to be disposed of, one-tenth might become vacant in the course of the year; in which case thirty-eight, or he would take forty places, for the sake of round numbers, which became disposable every year, would answer the patronage of four hundred only generally vacant. So that Government, according to this calculation, had from those two sources of patronage a direct and essential influence over 1,200 places in all. But the grand increase was in the Home Establishments, and chiefly in the collection of the revenue, the expenses of the management of which were fourfold what they were in 1780. In the former period they were less than one million; but the expenses of the collection of the revenue were now more than four millions some odd hundred thousands. But he would take the sum only as quadrupled, and he would call on the House upon that ground if he had no other to consider, whether they ought not to re-enact, with improvements, the laws of 1780, which the state of the country then called on Parliament to adopt. The present expense, which was four times as much as at the former period, was nearly as much as the whole interest of the National Debt in 1780. Another head of influence was one to which it was impossible for Parliament to shut their eyes; it was the increased amount of the Debt itself. He did not speak of this as relating to the payment of offices; but he looked on the increase of the interest of the debt as a great augmentation of the patronage of the Crown. At the former period that interest was about six millions, and it was now little less than fifty millions, which comprehended the whole of the expenditure for the interest and management of debt funded and unfunded; and he believed the exact numbers were 49,300,000*l.* Now the operation of this augmented debt was, besides exhausting the resources of the country and impoverishing the public, to place an increased number of persons in a situation of dependence on the Government, and to draw money more within the influence of the regal patronage. This was an addition to the direct influence, of which it was impossible for any one acquainted with the revenue laws to entertain a doubt. Those laws were so multiplied, so intricate, so minute and perplexed, that their effect was to hamper, beset, and obstruct, every branch of our internal commerce, and that so constantly and vexatiously as to surpass all description. It might be necessary, indeed, at present, to collect so great a sum of money; but the undeniable result was to place all traders, (and he would draw no distinction between ingenious and productive industry,) under the power of the executive officers of the Crown. The consequence was that

men in business, if they would act prudently, must act warily as affected the Administration; and however expert they might be in their occupations, must take heed to their ways as politicians. For he that man ever so able and skilful in his calling—be he ever so temperate and circumspect in his character, whose business came within the operation of the Revenue Acts, there were traps beneath his feet, which the Revenue placed there, and which it was almost impossible to escape. He was beset with snares that honesty could not avert, or vigilance elude, and he (Mr. B.) did not exaggerate when he said that any trader, who came in contact with that power which he described, found himself in collision with that frightful code which every trader had learned to dread—he meant the Revenue Laws. The result was, that there was hardly a private man, however he was capable of seeing the traps beneath his feet—however acute he was—however he might have his senses about him—that could always escape. He only spoke of what was the experience of every person in the line of life which he mentioned; but as many persons in that House might not be acquainted with those facts, he would give them one or two instances, which might be of some service to them, if it were only to gratify their curiosity. (*a laugh.*) When there were a multitude of instances to be cited, he always took at random, and he would now advert to the laws relative to Soap-making. He would allude to a section of the law, which showed with what a curious and prying eye, and nice hand, though with a rough application, the Government pierced into the private concerns of the traders of this country. The law stated, “That no Maker of Soap, under the penalty of five hundred pounds,” for those were generous laws which had nothing to do with fractions (*a laugh*), the penalties were never under the round sums of 100, 200, 300, or 500; and under this latter penalty of 500 all persons engaged in the soap-business were prohibited from having in their possession a pipe or other instrument for removing the less from the copper, or using a crane, syphon, or other contrivance, or carrying it from the copper to the other part of the machinery. And they were not only prevented from having a syphon or a crane, but they were likewise prohibited from having any hole or perforation in the copper. (*a laugh.*) But here a difficulty arose, and that was how to get the liquor out; for any man might put it in, but if no man could take it out it would be the last time the revenue would receive any benefit from it. (*a laugh.*) The law, however, solved this difficulty in one way. It said that the soap-maker might take out the less by a pump, and with a singular regard to the variety of machinery, and the fancy of the operator, the law gave him the additional privilege of using a ladle. (*loud laughter.*) But now arose another difficulty. If the less were kept in the coppers, they being of an explosive nature when boiling briskly, and were not allowed to escape in steam or vapour by a syphon or hole, the consequence would be destructive to the revenue; accordingly, with a singular degree of ingenuity, and with great mercy towards the sufferer—for the tradesman was only looked on in the light of one who was raising a revenue for Government (*hear, hear.*) they allowed him to perforate in the head of his copper certain small holes, and this perforation the enactors allowed with an abhorrence of a vacuum which would do honour to nature herself (*a laugh*) but took care that the small holes should not be more than one-eighth of an inch in diameter; and in some other section it was directed that the instrument for boring should be an augur, and no doubt it was guarded by similar penalties. By these means the revenue was served, and the explosion prevented.—It would be idle to state other instances of the same kind to show such laws affected, and embarrassed all the manipulations of the subject. Let the Salt Tax, for instance, be taken, than which nothing was in its principles or practice more oppressive. (*hear, hear.*) But the general principle, which was now considered most sacred in the Revenue Laws, and the very corner-stone of the system, was the throwing the burden of the proof on the accused. (*hear, hear.*) In every instance almost, the man was entrapped, and yet he was obliged to prove his innocence. But this principle, along with others, grown up of late in opposition to the established doctrines of English law, and one of the worst was that which was practised in the Exchequer Court, and which made the evidence of a private informer, that was looked to as not only odious, but insufficient and suspected in other Courts, was this—yes, the evidence of a reformer—(*here the mistake of the word reformer or informer, occasioned a loud laugh on the Treasury Benches.*) The Hon. and Learned Member corrected himself, and asserted, that the evidence of an informer, elsewhere so detestable, was in the Court of Exchequer received with peculiar favour by the Judge and Jury. A person of that kind had only to avow himself an informer, and he was sure to give weight to his evidence. When a man was Exchequered he knew it was his best plan to make terms at once with the Treasury, for he could not reasonably entertain any hope of acquittal; or his chance of conviction compared with that of acquittal, was in the proportion of the greatest number that could be conceived compared with the least assignable. (*hear, hear.*) He would state one instance more, relative to the Glass Tax, for that and the tax on salt, and others of a similar kind, were deserving of the reproach which was passed on the civil law before it was reformed, namely, that it was a load for a camel. (*a laugh.*) But in the instances of the glass duty, the Legislators had shewn themselves

as profoundly acquainted with the principles of mathematics as in the Soap Tax they proved their knowledge of mechanics. The law which they passed in 1811 on this subject appeared to surpass all previous absurdity. That law enacted, that the layers should be made in a particular way under a penalty of 100*l.*, and which was that particular way? Why, they were to be made rectangular, and with the sides perpendicular (*a laugh*); and not only were the sides to be perpendicular, but the ends also (*a laugh*), as was sagaciously said by those mathematicians of the Exchequer. (*loud laughter.*) But not only were the figures to be rectangular, but all the sides and ends were to be parallel to each other respectively; and to prevent the violation of an axiom of mathematics—to obviate the perpetration of a mathematical impossibility, there was a penalty of 100*l.* *in majorem cantelam.* (*much laughter.*) This was the Act of the 51st Geo. III. Now a considerable change had taken place within the last seven years with respect to persons under the process of the Exchequer. On the 19th July, 1814, at two o'clock in the morning, a Bill was brought into that House, and read for the first time without observation, for there was no one present who could discuss the principle. The Bill went to give a power to relieve persons under Exchequer process even after conviction. On the 25th it passed that House; on the 28th it passed the Lords; and, on the 30th, it received the Royal Assent, and put the finishing hand to the control which was before very great, but now became irresistible, which the Treasury had over all the branches of the Revenue. But to show the manner in which this system operated, he would give an instance of one of the late informations in the Exchequer, and any thing more oppressive he never heard of. Under the 49th Geo. III., for making strong and table beer, an information was filed, containing fourteen or fifteen counts, one count of which contained no less than 105 penalties, amounting to 21,000*l.* Such a mode of proceeding was calculated to distract and perplex the unfortunate defendant, and the ringing the changes on the penalties in such a way was enough to overwhelm and make it impossible for human nerves to stand the ordeal; and in nine cases out of ten the defendant, however guiltless, preferred sacrificing a large portion of his income to running the risk of certain ruin. (*hear.*) He mentioned this as an illustration of the proposition with which he set out, that in estimating the influence of the Crown, it was impossible to leave out of view the increase of the revenue to discharge the interest of the debt; because though that expense did not go to the payment of placemen, it went to grind the people, and to bring a great number within the grasp of its influence. Besides, the revenue laws were so complex and intricate, that they seemed to be written with the view that the people should not understand them; so that the most wary trader who came under their influence became at once a suitor to the crime, and, in consequence, there was a great increase of applications from Members of that House to the Treasury, on behalf of their constituents, so that the gates of the Treasury were worn by the crowd of visitors, and thereby was the direct influence which the Crown had over the subject, inevitably increased. He believed that all would admit that another leading feature in the augmentation of the influence was, that now the influence was better arranged and organized than before. Of all the increased influence since 1789, none was more effective than the increase of the real weight of patronage by that manner in which the Treasury had got its long arms into all the departments of the state. (*hear, hear.*) There was one instance before the House, when the patronage of the Excise and Custom-house yachts was taken away, a sum of money was actually voted by that House to the Treasury as a compensation for the consequent loss of patronage. The last argument was beyond all measure the most important. It was true we had now ended the great expenditure of the war, which occasioned an annual expenditure of one hundred and thirty-two millions, as was proved by the average of three years of the war—a sum which startled the imagination—which, however, they might speak of in terms, was scarcely understood, and eluded our very apprehension—but we had now come down from this sum to the more moderate but not insignificant sum of 77 or 8 millions, including the management of the debt. But let not be supposed that the expenses of the war had produced the whole effect—far from it. He would refer to particulars. A habit had grown up, out of the vast expenditure of the war, which it would take many years of a virtuous and vigilant Parliament to counteract, and that was the habit which prevailed chiefly among the higher classes, of looking to the Government, rich as it was in patronage, for the means of subsistence. When the Government had a moderate revenue, the hold which it had over the people was far different from that which he spoke of. When that was the case, the people were not trained to look for their subsistence from the public purse; they were more habituated to rely on the labour of their hands, and to seek in honest industry or skilful arts a creditable means of livelihood. But the vicious habit of dependence on the Government was now sustained by that irresistible influence which operated on society through the channels of the Army, the Navy, Auditorships, Writerships, Assistant-Surgencies, &c., containing employments of every size and every kind, not too insignificant to be below the pursuit of the greatest families, or too inaccessible not to corrupt the most moderate. Thus were men accustomed to a vicious and dependent habit, which was not known in poorer and more frugal

# PARLIAMENTARY.

—469—

Governments—and particularly were the higher classes tainted with this vice of looking to the Court and its interests for the means of support. If therefore did not so much signify that the expenses of the war had been diminished, for the habit remained, and there would be nearly the same competition now, and the dependence as great, as when the expenditure was 130 millions. When all these circumstances were taken into consideration, in comparing the year 1780 with the present time, he was enabled to say that Parliament were bound to come to the Resolution which they adopted at that time; and the reasons for it, instead of being weakened, had been confirmed, and required them to adopt measures of a more searching nature. (*hear, hear.*) He would only ask the House to remember what was said at that time by the person who moved the Resolution, and who stated what, if it were said by him (Mr. B.) at the present time, he would be thought to be the most indelicate person that ever opened his lips in that House. That Learned Person had talked of a corrupt and pecuniary influence within the walls of that House; and when asked what he meant, he declared that he knew fifty Members of Parliament who held opinions out of that House opposite to what they supported in it by their votes. (*hear, and a laugh.*) He also said that he did not wish to give personal offence to any one; but if he were goaded to it, he would name the 50 Members. Nobody, however, took up the challenge, and consequently he (Mr. B.) was unable to name them. (*a laugh.*) Another Learned Person, he meant the predecessor of a Right Hon. Gentleman who now occupied the Chair, declared in his place in the Committee, that he felt him bound as an honest man to state that the influence of the Crown had increased beyond all ideas of a Monarchy strictly limited in its nature and extent. He would add to those the opinion of one who was never signalised by shewing any spirit of opposition to the Court, and who had never thwarted one measure of the Government—he meant Mr. Justice Blackstone. That opinion of his was anterior to the American war, when the system of influence was vastly below what it was at present. He stated then what had been gained by the people since 1680, and he mentioned the Bill of Rights, and other popular advantages, and on stating the other side of the account, evidently intended to strike the balance against the people; for he said that although by those advantages the influence of the Crown was in appearance and nominally reduced; yet, if there were thrown into the other scale, the Riot Act, the establishment of the standing army, the manner of levying the millions to pay the interest of the debt, &c. it would appear that the influence of the Crown would more than set off all which the people had gained. And since that opinion was expressed, which was in 1765, matters were not improved; for then there was the Riot Act, and now we had our Six Acts. (*hear, hear.*) Then there was a standing army of 17,000 men, and now of 90,000. Then there was enormous levy of yearly millions, and the personal attachment arising out of the interest of the debt, but the capital of the debt was then 130 millions, and it was now 800; and the interest was then four and half millions, and it was now upwards of forty. (*hear, hear.*) Who could for a moment doubt that Mr. Dunning, that Sir F. Norton, that Mr. Justice Blackstone, or even that the very House of Commons who passed the resolution of 1780, passed it in order that it might be commensurate with the existing mischief, and offered a remedy adequate to the augmented evil that had accrued since the preceding reform? He would now come to consider the answer which had been given to this part of his argument. He did not imagine that the answer which had been given by Mr. Rose, in 1810, would be given at the present day; namely, that in reality as many places under Government had been abolished as had been created. In fact, that answer depended on a quibble; a number of places, averaging about 50l. a-year had been abolished in the Salt department, while other places, not as numerous, but averaging about 300l. a-year, had been created. The next answer which he expected was that there were fewer placemen in the House of Commons at the present moment than in the year 1780. To that answer, if it were made, he would reply by asking—how many fewer? Let the two periods be compared. In the year 1780, there were in the House of Commons between 80 and 90—call it 90 placemen. Now, as appeared by the returns which had been made to the motion of his Hon. Friend, the Member for Shrewsbury, there were upwards of seventy, making a deduction of a few who did not come strictly within the description of that class of placemen to which influence of Government applied. His Honourable Friend told him, that there were eighty seven placemen in all, and that of those there were eighty to whom the argument was applicable. The reduction, in point of number, was therefore very trifling. But he must protest against any argument grounded on that consideration alone. It was not merely the comparative number of placemen in Parliament at the two periods which ought to be considered. The House ought to consider what was the comparative amount of the patronage placed at the disposal of the Ministers of the Crown. They ought to consider that the existing amount, as compared with the amount in 1780, was as twenty-eight to eight or ten millions. They ought to consider the effect of the whole sum expended not only in the House itself in direct influence, but in the support of the Government out of the House, at County Meetings, at Elections, &c. It signified very little,

whether a member of the House was influenced by holding an office himself, or by others out of the House holding offices. There was the same attendance at the Treasury in the morning to obtain the emolument—there was the same attendance at the House in the evening to vote in support of those by whom that emolument was conferred. The people suffered just as much as if so many additional placemen, properly so called, actually sat in the House. But another answer to the argument derived from the diminution in the absolute number of placemen in the House, he would derive from what had taken place in 1780. Placemen had been excluded from that House by Acts of the Legislature passed long before that period. The Statutes of Anne, and of George I. excluded a great many pensioners; the Statute of George II. lopped off many more, and yet, 40 years after the passing of the Place Bill, no man pretended for a moment to argue, that because 40 years before an improvement in that respect had taken place, the House ought to stop short, and proceed no further in the course of melioration. It was readily allowed in 1780, that there were not so many placemen in the House of Commons as there were before the Statutes to which he had last alluded. But that admission, it was contended, availed nothing in the argument; because the Crown had, in other respects, gained a most overwhelming influence. The establishments of the country, it was observed, had more than doubled. Many more millions of the public money were placed at the disposal of the Ministers of the Crown. As it was at that time found impracticable to reduce those establishments, and thereby to apply the remedy to the root of the evil, some other course, it was said, must be adopted; and it was added, that the obvious one was to diminish the influence of the Crown, by excluding still more placemen from the House than their ancestors had done in 1742. Such was the argument which had been urged in the year 1780; and it was an argument directly applicable to the present question. If the argument were strong in 1780, it was irresistible at present beyond all comparison, that the same principle of reduction should be adopted, and the same remedy applied, under the same views of the subject. He now came to the consideration—and he had great satisfaction in saying so—of the last answer to his argument—an answer which never failed to be given whenever the question of Reform came in any shape to be agitated—he meant the answer which arose from what was called the right working of the system. It was admitted to be true that the necessary consequence of our large establishments was an increase of the influence of the Crown; but then it was maintained that taking the whole system together, we had as much practical liberty as before that influence had so greatly increased. If, however, in former days, the evil of the overweening influence of the Crown was considered to be a main cause of the grievances which the people suffered, how much more must it be so at the present time, when we had witnessed the conduct of Parliament under the operation of that system so highly praised? There was one point on which all persons who had examined the working of the system with the least possible attention must be prepared to agree; namely, that whoever happened to be the Minister of the Crown, as the question respected the person, and whatever might be the measure proposed, as the question respected the thing, the House of Commons were always found ready to support that individual, because he was Minister, and to approve that measure, because it emanated from him. (*hear.*) He had no hesitation in laying down this proposition as broadly as it was possible to state it; indeed there was hardly a single exception to it; namely, that so great was the influence of the Executive Government in the House and in the country, that any one individual who could be named, might be sent down to-morrow; but he would not speak of the present Parliament, he would speak only of the last five or six Parliaments, and he would say, that during those Parliaments, any individual might have been sent down to the House of Commons as a Minister of the Crown, and the moment that he had taken his seat on the Bench opposite, might have depended on the support of whatever measures he chose to bring forward, by a great majority of the Members of the House; provided always, that on the one hand, such a person had been taken from any of those classes which usually furnish official persons, and that, on the other hand, he determined to risk his continuance in office on the success of the measures that he proposed. Let the House examine a little the facts on which he founded this proposition. In the last division which took place, before Mr. Pitt went out of office, in 1801, that Minister found himself in his usual triumphant majority, of about four to one. The majority on that occasion was 245; only 63 Members of a House of about 300 venturing to oppose Mr. Pitt by their votes on that occasion. It was vainly imagined in those days, and as frequently boasted by the partial friends of that great man, that he enjoyed the sway which he possessed in Parliament, and in the country, not so much as the result of the favour of his Sovereign, as in consequence of his character as a statesman, of his great hereditary name, of his splendid talents, and of his unimpeached personal integrity. But when Mr. Pitt went out of office, and when he was succeeded by another Right Honourable Gentleman, who resembled him only in one single particular, and that a quality which the friends of Mr. Pitt, and indeed the country at large, vainly imagined was the

least of the causes of Mr. Pitt's influence, namely, that he was the King's chief Minister, and represented his Majesty's Government in the House of Commons; every one, whether from personal esteem for that individual, or from tenderness for the character of the House of Commons, or from that spirit of optimism which induces many men to wish to imagine that the particular frame of Government under which they happen to live, is as perfect as possible, believed that Mr. Addington would retain his majorities in the House of Commons, only while with his Sovereign's favour he retained the more material advantage of Mr. Pitt's confidence and supports. Unhappily, however, events proved that what all men supposed to be the most powerful support of Mr. Addington's Administration, was in fact the least powerful support of it. The supposed influence of Mr. Pitt in the House of Commons, resulting from his claims to public respect and favour, instead of being found to be the most powerful agent in producing the vast numerical force which had arranged itself under his banners, turned out most unexpectedly, not only to be the most powerful agent in producing that effect, but to be not in the least operative upon it. For, on the very first trial of strength between Mr. Pitt and Mr. Addington, then become twain, what occurred? The House of Commons for the first time opened their eyes to the schism, which had taken place between the Ex-Minister and the Minister for the time being. When they were rather rudely put to the test on the subject, when they were somewhat unfeelingly, and with little regard to their delicacy, compelled to come to a decision between the rivals, when Mr. Pitt put the question boldly to them, when he told them that he wanted no more fine speeches, no more soft flattery, no more songs in his praise, no more tirades against his enemies, when he exclaimed "Come to the vote, Members of my ancient majorities; let me hear those who for 20 years have followed my standard while I dispensed the places, the patronage, and the emoluments of the Crown, declare if they prefer Mr. Addington to myself,"—333 Hon. Gentlemen, in a House of 400, freely, candidly, and fairly confessed, that in point of fact they did prefer Mr. Addington, (laughter, and cries of hear.) Mr. Pitt's hereditary talents, the fame of his great ancestor, his popularity in the House of Commons for a quarter of a century, the tenacity of his adherents, the love of his friends, the gratitude of the placemen whom he had served, of the contractors whom he had replenished, of the Aldermen, of the Honourable Baronets, of the Honourable Knights of the Shire, of the Honourable Representatives of Rotten Boroughs, of all those by whose aid he had been accustomed to sway the decisions of Parliament, and enabled to discomfit every political antagonist, from Mr. Fox down to that Hon. Gent. whom he (Mr. Brougham) would not name, but who shook a shattered bank-note in derision of "the solid system of Finance" of the day—all forsook him at once; and on a personal question of confidence, the great majority of the House of Commons agreed to withdraw that confidence from Mr. Pitt, and to repose it in Mr. Addington. (hear, hear, hear!) Mr. Addington's character as a statesman, his hereditary talents, his great personal qualities, the love of his friends, his undiminished and unenvied popularity, suddenly rendered him an overmatch for all Mr. Pitt's qualities, and for all the gratitude and affection which it might have been supposed Mr. Pitt had secured in the House of Commons, and Mr. Pitt found himself all at once in a most deplorable minority. Only 56 Members voted for Mr. Pitt's motion—

"—faithful found  
Among the faithless; faithful only they."

When Mr. Addington afterwards made a motion himself, which required as explicit a declaration of opinion, painful to relate, the fifty-six fell off to fifty-five. (a laugh.) Subsequently to that event a coalition was formed—Mr. Windham and the friends of Lord Grenville, Mr. Fox and his party, Mr. Pitt and his friends, combined and made head against Mr. Addington and his friends. Upwards of a year the contest was fiercely maintained; and then a change of Ministry was effected; but how? A most suspicious circumstance was observed by all who learnt the names of the new Ministers; namely, that the greater number of them, including the Noble Marquis of posite, had been Members of the Addington Administration. There was every reason to believe that they and Mr. Pitt had a perfect understanding with one another. Of this fact indeed no man of common sense entertained the slightest doubt, that if Mr. Addington had been stoutly supported by all Mr. Pitt's friends who were in his Cabinet, and if he had risked standing by his Sovereign as firmly as his Sovereign appeared disposed to stand by him, for aught any one knew, he might have been the Minister of the country down to the present moment. To proceed, however, with the history of the conduct of Parliament. The House of Commons, which so distinguished itself by its fidelity and consistency in 1803 was not dissolved until the latter end of 1806. The animosity with which Mr. Fox had been treated by that House in the earlier stages of its existence was well known. The high character of that great man with the people at large, and the praises of him which were echoed from one end of the kingdom to the other, had no effect in mitigating that animosity. Nay, it rather aggravated than diminished it. Many statements of the most atrocious nature were made in that House with respect to Mr. Fox's politics and conduct, and he was even accused of unfurling the standard of rebellion. At no one period of

these early stages of the House of Commons in question, could Mr. Fox assemble a band of sufficient strength to enable him to make successful head against the Minister to whom he was politically opposed. But an event happened in 1806, which let in upon that Honourable House of Commons a light almost as vivid as that which had broken in upon it when Mr. Pitt ceased to be a Minister in 1803. That event was no less than Mr. Fox's coming into office; an event of which the House of Commons were most curiously observant. For let it be remarked, that among all the incidents which took place in public life, among the various changes which occurred, no one event was watched with more anxious eyes by a House of Commons, no one event was calculated to induce them to frame their conduct more warily than when a suspicion arose that any individual was sent for to the closet of the Sovereign for the purpose of assisting in the formation of a new Ministry. Of any such occurrence the House of Commons were the most anxious, sedulous, and vigilant observers. (a laugh.) Accordingly, having ascertained by THE GAZETTE, that a change of Administration had occurred—having ascertained, by that authentic document, that there could be no doubt of the fact, a correlative change began to manifest itself within those walls. For on the 3d of March, 1806, that same House of Commons, which had treated Mr. Fox so unceremoniously from the very moment of their election, expressed no longer any apprehension of his policy, talked no more about his unfurling the standard of rebellion, objected no farther to his person, mistrusted no longer his principles, but followed his banner as implicitly, and in as great numerical force as they had done that of his predecessor! A very remarkable instance was afforded of the complete change of sentiment which that Honourable House of Commons had undergone, in the question on which that sentiment was first distinctly pronounced. For a considerable time no attempt was ventured at bringing the House to a division; but at length, in the month of March, an Honourable Member connected with the Noble Marquis opposite, brought forward a proposition founded on a measure which the new Administration had adopted. For himself, he (Mr. Brougham) would freely say, what he had never hesitated to say, however widely he might differ in general politics from the individuals in whom that proposition had originated, that if ever there was a strong question submitted to the decision of Parliament, it was that question. He would venture to say, that there never was a stronger case than was involved in the proposed resolution of censure on his Majesty's then Government for the admission of Lord Ellenborough to a seat in the cabinet. What was the consequence? The House behaved with their usual kind and tender forbearance towards all men in office, which could be equalled only by their stern, iron firmness towards all men out of office. Their indulgence and gentleness to Ministers were in exact proportion to their constitutional obduracy towards the opponents of Ministers. In short, when the question was brought to a division, by a curious coincidence, only 65 Members voted against Mr. Fox and his colleagues on that strong constitutional question; being about the same number that had divided with Mr. Fox against Mr. Pitt on the last division which took place in the same House of Commons before Mr. Pitt went out of office. He repeated, that this was a very curious coincidence. The last division that occurred before Mr. Pitt quitted office, was 245 to 68 in favour of that Minister, and against Mr. Fox. In March, 1806, however, the tables were turned; 222 Members voted for Mr. Fox; and the survivors of Mr. Pitt, those who called their party by his name, those who had fought under his banners, those who might justly consider themselves entitled to the gratitude of the individuals whom Mr. Pitt had politically benefitted, could muster no more than 65 Honourable Members to vote against Mr. Fox and for them, on that strong and pinching question. (hear, hear.) It would be tedious to go at much greater length into this part of the subject. If any one wanted further illustration of the pliancy of the House of Commons at former periods, he was quite ready to afford it; but he protested that he was utterly at a loss to conceive how any conclusion but one could be drawn from the facts which he had already detailed. He would, however, mention a few more. Having taken an instance from the conduct of a House of Commons assembled under Tory auspices, he would take an instance from the conduct of a House of Commons assembled under Whig auspices. God forbid that he should for a moment consider those auspices as equal in value. But he would, nevertheless, briefly advert to some of the circumstances in the conduct of the House of Commons that was assembled under the auspices of the Whig Government of autumn, 1806. And here he would observe, that there was a great change in the composition of that Assembly. There had been what in modern times was called by some "a purging of the House." No fewer than 150 new Members were introduced into the Parliament which met at that period. It was naturally to be supposed that such a House would, in some degree, redeem the character which its predecessors had lost.—And so at first it did. But its conduct throughout the whole of its career were scrutinised, it would be found much worse, and much more discreditable even than that of their illustrious predecessors. As might be expected, considerable differences of opinion arose on the opening of that Parliament, between the Ministers of the Crown and their political opponents. Those

differences were stated at an early period of the Session, by several of the latter, and especially by an Honourable Gentleman in his eye, who, if he mistook not, moved an amendment to the Address on the first day of the Session, with a view to shew the different views of policy entertained by the different parties in the House. For a considerable time, however, the opponents of the existing Government, aware that they should only show their own weakness, and the strength of their antagonists, did not venture to divide on any question. First, then, was the subject of foreign affairs; on that question a motion was made, but no division was pressed. Then came the consideration of the Army Estimates, involving the question of Mr. Windham's military plans. Still no division. Afterwards the Orders in Council were discussed, on which Mr. Perceval made a motion; but no division was pressed. Next came Sir S. Romilly's Bill, being the first attempt of that learned and illustrious person to reform the Criminal Law; a proposition made in the most moderate and temperate manner, but exceedingly objected to by the Hon. Gentlemen in opposition, and especially by one, than whom, with the exception of Mr. Pitt, perhaps no man had ever greater personal sway in the House of Commons; he meant Sir W. Grant, the Master of the Rolls. To that Bill numerous objections were raised, but no division was resorted to. Even on the Maynooth College vote, a question on which Mr. Perceval declared he would make a stand; a question on which he gave notice that he would rouse the whole country to opposition (a menace which he afterwards carried into effect, and on the cry which he then contrived to raise, built his accession to power); even on that Maynooth College vote, no division took place. It was not until February, when the Petition from Hampshire, complaining of a corrupt election, was presented, and when it was thought that there was a strong case which might induce many Honourable Members to vote against Government, that the first division occurred; and the result was 184 to 57 in favour of Ministers. Question after question followed, without any division, until the 12th of March, when on another division the minority did not exceed 60. And here he begged to observe, that the 12th of March was an important epoch. The House of Commons were approaching a very critical time. Rumours were spread of certain things passing elsewhere, which made the Members of the House of Commons quite alive. They began to look sharply about them—to try to see their way—as they had done after the decease of Mr. Pitt. They began to find out that things were not as they were before. They began to feel the necessity of taking care what they were about. They began to be aware that they had better be quiet—that they had better abstain from all strong demonstrations—that they had better steer near the land and with a snug sail, lest they should get on a lee-shore and be suddenly shipwrecked. They did not exactly understand what was passing around them; but they knew that something was passing. Birds of ill omen were fluttering about, and who knew what might ensue? It was evident that something was not as it should be; but that was very immaterial. The great point was that something was not as it had been. (a laugh.) Mr. Fox was no more. His friends, it was true, were in office; but it was not very clear whether they ought to be supported. They (the Members of the House of Commons) were plain downright matter of fact men. They wished to know how affairs stood. They wished to know whether the man apparently in power were *de facto* Ministers. "Make it quite clear to us—clear to demonstration, that you are not going out," they exclaimed, "and then we shall immediately know what to do." (a laugh.) In the mean while they comforted themselves as the Members of the House of Commons were wont to comport themselves whenever they were engaged in such an interesting speculation. The first thing in those cases was a tendency on the part of Hon. Members to absent themselves from the House. There were suddenly many calls into the country.—Journies were to be taken for health, for amusement; or for the health and amusement of dear friends and relations. It was quite astonishing to perceive the ties which bound a Member of Parliament to his home when it was not convenient to him to take his place in the House. (laughter.) Accordingly, at the period to which he had been alluding, the numerical force of the House of Commons speedily dwindled to one-half its usual amount. The suspense, however, began to be painful. It would have become intolerable had it been much longer protracted. But at length it pleased his Majesty to put an end to all doubt and indecision by a change of Ministry. On the 12th of March, only 60 Honourable Members could be found to support a strong measure proposed to them by the opponents of the then Administration.—On the 3rd of March, only 57 had been found ready to support a still stronger measure. And yet, no sooner had the house been enabled to look well about them, no sooner had they had time and opportunity to take an observation, no sooner had they ascertained what was the real looming and character of circumstances, no sooner, in short, had they made themselves sure of who were to be in and who were to be out of office, than the sixty or fifty-seven Members became expanded in a most marvellous manner to 258; that being, to the great astonishment of all beholders, the number of Members who voted for the negative of the proposition, whether or not the House of Commons reposed any confidence in his Majesty's late Ministers. Thus

did a large majority of that House, in which but a very short period before only 57 Members could be found to express their disapprobation of those Ministers, come forward to protest that they never liked those Ministers, that they liked any Ministers better, and that they were very grateful to his Majesty for having taken the public affairs out of their hands! Aye; and had it pleased the King to change the Administration on the day after, the Members would again have looked about them, they would again have taken an observation, they would again have seen what way they were going, they would again have slackened their attendance in the first instance, they would again have eventually confessed that they always preferred Mr. Fox and his friends, and that they had never liked these new men, whom they would probably have characterised as mere clerks of office, as followers of Mr. Pitt, who were unworthy to hold the candle to their great predecessor and model; and they would have assured his Majesty that Lord Grey and Lord Grenville appeared to them to be the only individuals worthy of the honour of his confidence, for that on them alone had fallen the mantle of the illustrious Statesman, whose principles they maintained, (*hear, hear, hear, and laughter.*) All that would have been said on the morrow had those eminent individuals been reinstated in power. This principle of Government influence operated on other bodies besides Parliament. Although he might do so, he would not go to Corporations for instances of that fact, because Corporations were not worthy of the comparison. But he would take his example from the conduct of a grave, learned, and most venerable body, whose dignified duty, it was to dispense the blessings of education over the land, and of whose institutions, morality and religion, were the corner stones:—he meant the learned and venerable University of Oxford. Undoubtedly that illustrious and erudite body possessed great quickness of discernment, great powers of prognostication on the subject of which he had been speaking. Hardly could the House of Commons itself manifest greater alacrity in the detection of falling or of rising political influence. Never had they exhibited, in modern times, since their predilection for the old family, the stain of which they had washed out by their subsequent conduct to the new, any want of due vigilance on the point in question, except in the solitary instance of their election of Lord Grenville to the Chair of the Chancellor of the University. But even then they had their excuse. Every appearance at the time indicated that Lord Grenville was coming into office. The Walcheren Expedition had just overwhelmed its projectors with shame. It was well known that there were great squabbles in the Cabinet. Two of the Members of that Cabinet were already gone. A message had been sent from the King to eminent individuals opposed to the existing Administration. Mr. Perceval appeared to be in treaty with Lord Grey, and still more closely with Lord Grenville. It was altogether pretty clear that there would be some change in the Administration, and every thing pointed out Lord Grenville as the probable chief of the new Ministry. Henceforward, however, the University would, no doubt, be more cautious. Henceforward they would follow the prudent example of the House of Commons. Henceforward they would see the *GAZETTE* before they ventured to act. Henceforward they would listen to no rumours on the subject:—they would not believe that any man was fairly out of office until they saw the appointment of his successor *Gazetted*. They had paid too dearly for their experience not to benefit from it; for they chose Lord Grenville to be their Chancellor, and from that day the Noble Lord had never held any situation of official trust and responsibility. As an additional proof of the watchful attention of the University of Oxford to men in power, let the House recollect their conduct on the Catholic Question. On the 5th of March, 1817, Mr. Perceval declared that the Bill which had been introduced by his Majesty's Government was one of the most dangerous measures which had ever been proposed to Parliament; and that it ought to be opposed by all who felt an interest in maintaining the established religion of the State. Accordingly, on the 17th March, a Petition was presented from the University of Oxford, in which they expressed their anxiety, their consternation, their horror, at a Bill which threatened to break down all the barriers of our civil and religious establishments. They also declared their conviction, that the security of all the existing oaths and tests were indispensable to the maintenance of these establishments. It was well known that Mr. Perceval persevered in his opposition to the Bill in question. Aided by the efforts of that most learned and powerful body, the University of Oxford, to whose exertions the University of Cambridge lent their assistance, he lighted a flame which nearly consumed the peace of the country. The public tranquillity was hazarded by men who, to further their own political interests, did not scruple to raise—he was going to say a religious, but an irreligious, base, brutal, unchristian cry of "Popery!" The outcry thus raised by Mr. Perceval, its author, perhaps honestly, but seconded dishonestly by hundreds and thousands—this base outcry, having accomplished its object of destroying one Administration and replacing another, and having given to the countenance of the King towards any set of individuals the inevitable sequel of that countenance, a triumphant majority in the House of Commons—what followed? That very measure so exclaimed against;

that very measure for admitting Catholics into the Army and the Navy was introduced into the House of Commons by the identical Ministers who had been so loud in its reprobation, had passed that House, and had afterwards passed the other House of Parliament *sub silentio*, not a single word having been spoken against it by any spiritual Peer, although only 10 years before it had been pronounced a measure pregnant with the most disastrous and frightful consequences! He had looked over the Journals of the House, to see if he could discover any address from the University of Oxford on that occasion; but none had he been able to find, and if it existed it could not weaken his argument. However, he believed that that most wary and conciliating body knew better than to petition against a measure that met the sanction of the ruling authorities. (*hear, hear*) They who had evinced a conduct so vacillating, unsteady, and indefensible, had forfeited every principle on which they might hope in future to enjoy their own self-respect, or to claim the gratitude of posterity. He would next allude to the Walcheren party. (*hear, hear*) The well known expedition which bore this name took its origin under that very set of men whose acts did stand recorded in so many pages of our history, that he should only weary the House and, ineffectually waste their time by entering into any recapitulation on the subject. The House (as we understood the Honourable and Learned Gentleman), acting with that correctness and nicety of calculation for which it was distinguished, while the Prince Regent was not yet in possession of unlimited power, and his late Majesty's recovery was still expected, opposed that illustrious personage in all his claims. They voted with Ministers against him on every occasion, in large majorities. And soon afterwards they voted with the Ministers—they supported the Prince Regent, as soon as his late Majesty's recovery had become extremely doubtful, as strongly as formerly they had voted against him. (*hear, hear*) It was not to be wondered at that the majorities which these persons made up were by no means so great, however, after they had determined to support the Prince Regent, as they had been on former occasions. In one or two instances, the divisions were nearly run in his Royal Highness's favour; and in the year 1812, his Royal Highness might boast a large and respectable minority. But this circumstance furnished an exception to the rule which he (Mr. Brougham) had laid down. It was, on the contrary, only a confirmation of its truth. With their usual nicety of calculation, they (the House) held that though his Majesty might recover, it was not very likely that he would;—that if he should recover, his life, on account of his great age, could not be expected to last long. Here, then was the secret of the thing; for though men were usually apt to be misled by their wishes, a Parliament was too clearly calculating a body to be so misled. When it was a measuring account; when the chance on the one side was, that for the short remaining portion of his life the Minister of that day might continue to be the Minister of the King; or, on the other hand, that for a certain period, at least, he was likely to remain so—the House calculated that so long, at least, his influence would continue; a period not very extensive, to be sure, for they all knew that usually Court favour endured not very long. To that extent, however, the calculation of men would go; and accordingly the same steady and average majorities were not to be found at this period, that usually were to be found on common ministerial questions. So the House continued to act; and thought they did not vote, they still appeared disposed, during the continuance of the restrictions against the claims and interests of the Prince Regent; they were for proceeding by bill, instead of address, in order to delay His Royal Highness's accession to his full powers. No sooner did His Royal Highness succeed to those powers, than he or as he (Mr. Brougham) should rather say, his Ministers, enjoyed the same privilege which had never departed from his Ministers before that period—the privilege of always commanding majorities of that House.—(*hear, hear*) Here he (Mr. Brougham) might remind the House of the expedition to Copenhagen; he might remind them of the Cintra question; he might especially remind them of those remarkable votes in 1814, when within three weeks the House voted, first, by a narrow majority, an Address to the Crown to give them a sufficient Minister; and afterwards, the Crown having refused to give them a new Minister, the same House—being then quite assured that the Crown would keep the one it had—the very same House, the moment their calculation was at an end, seeing that the Prince Regent was determined to retain him—did what? That which they always had done—they supported the Minister, and he had a majority of a hundred in his favour on a motion tending to reverse the former one—whereas, (only three weeks before,) he had been actually in a minority. (*hear, hear*) But it was impossible, after looking to the case of the Walcheren expedition, and the currency question, that any one should pause for a single instant to contemplate these minor inconsistencies, and these less flagrant violations of duty. He meant to speak with little disrespect of this House of Commons. (*hear, hear*) Bad as their votes had been on recent occasions—much as they had erred in supporting the most expensive and the most ineffectual measures of relief—greatly to be blamed as on many occasions they certainly had been—much as the country had reason to complain of their votes; yet all that they had done, and he would ven-

ture to say all that they could do, would never equal those two enormous and astonishing passages in the history of the Parliament he had been speaking of, in one of which they voted their approbation to those Ministers who had shamefully squandered the lives, and the treasure, and the honour, the resources, and even the very hopes of the country, while on the other, they voted a proposition introduced by the same Ministers, in respect to the relative value of two descriptions of currency to be true, which every one knew then, as well as it was now demonstrated, to be utterly false. (*hear, hear*) When they found these amazing and most disgraceful inconsistencies recorded of one and the same House of Commons, all who heard him must indulge the hope that they might never live to see another set of public men, who could in this manner place all principles—he spoke, of course, of public principles—all duty to their country—all regard to their own character and station, so completely out of sight. (*hear*) The present Parliament, he would admit, had fallen far short of these delinquencies; but he thought that there was enough even in the retrospect which the present Parliament would furnish, to make it not unworthy to be looked at. (*hear*) He would, therefore, only remind the House of two or three passages in their own history, which though they might quite emulate the fame of the Walcheren scheme, and other of our military expeditions, were yet in some regards like the armaments of 1805 and 1806, and betrayed something like the same principles of conduct by which the Parliament of those periods had been actuated.—In the last Session, his Hon. Friend, (the Member for Essex, (Mr. Western), brought forward a motion for the repeal of the Malt Tax; which motion was carried against Ministers by a majority. Upon that event taking place, many men were either ignorant or thoughtless enough to think that it might actually prove a benefit to the landed interest. (*a laugh*) Already had they begun to cherish hopes—to indulge, by anticipation, a species of joy—when they were checked by the cool astuteness, or the confident fore-knowledge of the Noble Marquis; who being, probably, from his long possession of office, more acquainted than other men, with the secret springs of action, anticipated, no doubt, the result. Those Hon. Members accordingly, whose hopes had been prematurely excited, the Noble Marquis on that occasion told, in a homely but expressive phrase not to “halloo before they got out of the wood.” Well did the Noble Lord say so.—(*hear*) Well did he foresee what would happen; and quite easy must it have been for him to look complacently on the good-natured persons who were giving a loose to their joy before the proper time.—(*hear, hear*) That Noble Lord well knew how to put in motion what was vulgarly called “the whip.” He found in its place his old majority; he determined to resort to a threat which was never known within the memory of the oldest person in that House to fail—he threatened to resign, and that Ministers should immediately retire; and the threat succeeded. In short, the former majority in support of the repeal, the majority of 21, was outvoted, and shortly after the whole object of the motion brought forward by the Member for Essex was defeated by Ministers, supported by a larger majority than that which had little time before carried it. (*hear*) In 1820, he (Mr. Brougham) himself had the fortune to obtain a majority on a proposition which he submitted for the appointment of an Agricultural Committee, in opposition to the Noble Lord and his Majesty's Ministers, who strongly opposed the motion. What transpired the next morning he neither knew nor ought to know. (*a laugh*) But really the event of the next evening was quite sufficient to show that something extraordinary must have transpired in the course of that morning; reasoning only upon the ancient and approved maxim that every effect must have a cause. (*a laugh*) Some communication from some quarter must have been made to Hon. Members of that House. Whether it was a direct communication, or some vague hint only, to gentlemen, that another such majority, and somehow or other Ministers would resign. (*a laugh*) he (Mr. Brougham) could not undertake to determine. But certain it was, that the very next night he saw with his own eyes, and he would even confess, to his great astonishment, the same Hon. Gentlemen who had supported his motion on the preceding evening, supporting the Noble Lord in reversing it. (*hear*) He would not say with Mr. Dunning, that he saw 50 Members pursuing this extraordinary course; but he would say, that he was morally certain of this—of those who voted with him on a particular question on one evening, he saw very many, on the same question, voting against him the next night. And what confirmed him in this was, that one Hon. Friend, who had acted on his first vote by repeating it on the second evening, expressed to him (Mr. B.) his extreme surprise at finding other gentlemen had been less mindful of their consistency. The next instance he should mention was that of “the grinding clause.” (*a laugh*) Very little importance, perhaps, attached to this case, as compared with others, that he had named; but it was well known that little matters were sometimes very good indications of principles of greater moment. The Right Hon. Member for Liverpool introduced this grinding clause; and the Noble Lord who spoke upon the occasion made no opposition to it, and intimated none. It was carried on its first introduction, by a great majority. —On the next night the Noble Lord came down to the

# PARLIAMENTARY.

—473—

House; and it soon appeared that he had made up his mind to vote against it. The weight of Government was now thrown into the scale, and there was just as great a majority accordingly against the clause as only one night before had voted in its favour. (*hear.*) But he (Mr. Brougham) conceived that he had now said enough to establish his propositions. He meant to say, that any Member of the executive Government (looking to its present state) whom the King might choose to appoint his Minister—upon him the King might bestow a certain majority in Parliament. (*hear, hear.*) And it was not merely that that majority consisted in a great measure of the placemen in that House who voted—(although the experience of last session had been suffered to shew that there were enough of them to determine nine questions out of ten connected with the state of the country)—but by far the greater number of individuals who composed that majority, might serve to prove the still further influence which was possessed in that House by the Crown. It might serve also to indicate the vastly more fatal effect which was produced on the independence and integrity of Parliament, by their obtaining favours for their friends and adherents, by their receiving kindnesses from his Majesty's Ministers, which did not exactly amount to holding office; but which, when given in that large measure which our immense revenue and its collection allowed of, amounted, in fact, to as effectual a disqualification from discharging independently the duties of Members of Parliament, as if they held office against the express provisions of the statute. It was upon these grounds—upon these views of the conduct of Parliament—upon finding that it was the same under all Administrations, and that it varied only with the variations of Court favour; that it was accommodated to the laws that were assigned to it; and that, as it was only from these circumstances that it could be exposed to the enormous influence of the Crown, so the effect produced was fully proportionate to the immoderate size of that cause. It was upon these several grounds—that he had brought before the House a resolution, which might afford it an opportunity of expressing its sense of the existing evil to the people (*cheers*)—and afterwards, of providing a remedy, by acting upon it. (*cheers.*) He should perhaps be told, that on many occasions the voice of the country had penetrated within those walls; and instances might be quoted to him, in which the people, after warmly differing from the determination of Parliament, had at length been enabled to acquiesce in its decisions. When he looked, however, at the most remarkable instances to which this observation would apply, so from forming any exceptions to the general rule which he had laid down, they offered the most striking and apposite exemplifications of it that he could mention. Who denied, that in time the voice of the public would be heard? Who doubted that in time its representations must be heard in that House? (*hear.*) Did any one suppose that as long as any liberty survived in his country, or while we preserved a free press (*cheering*)—as long as we possessed a bench that was uncorrupted and a bar that was independent (*hear*)—or while that House remained; for however it might upon occasions have forfeited its rights or neglected its duties—however frequently it might have approved itself true to the Crown and to its Ministers, but false to the country and the people—it was at least a bar of free discussion (*hear*); and as long as their doors were thrown open, and the country might know through the publicity of their proceedings what was going on there, did any one suppose, or was it not in vain to doubt, but that arbitrary power had its limits? It was equally certain, that while freedom of debate was preserved among them, while the press, in all its departments, and the law, he trusted, in all hers, contributed to secure to us as much liberty and independence as could be enjoyed without an independent Parliament; it was in vain to say that the public voice would not penetrate those walls. (*hear, hear.*) But what he complained of was, that the times did not sufficiently coincide—that the misery which existed, was felt to-day, to-morrow, and year after year; but it was never acknowledged until some 20 or 30 years had elapsed after it had been first perceived; after the country has been in all that interval oppressed by the mischief, and Parliament has submitted to the conduct of the Ministers of the Crown. His complaint therefore, was that the times did not coincide; that all this misery, year after year was permitted to take place, without being remedied. They waited until the quiet pool should be troubled; they waited until the deep but stagnant waters should be ruffled by the storm and the tempest. In the mean time they were pursuing all the courses of his Majesty's Ministers, however degrading to the Parliament, or destructive to the country. In the course of time, however, they would be turning an ear to the voices which were heard out of doors—they would be listening to the groans of the people at this moment suffering—they would not be deaf to the cries of humanity, as they had so long been, in the case of the slave-trade, which was one of the remarkable instances that he had alluded to; those cries at the end, only, of 30 years, ever since the commencement of which they had been ceaselessly arising to us, had produced their effect;—when with a reformed parliament, under similar circumstances, they would have been as effectual in as many months. (*cheers.*) The slave trade, indeed, was the very instance for his (Mr. Brougham's) purpose.

It was universally condemned, at home and abroad. There was an unanimity of all parties, and nothing was wanting to effect its abolition, except that it was not supported by a Minister of State. All that was ever wanting, indeed, for this purpose was, that the Minister should have made it what was called a cabinet question. A Minister might have carried it as easily as a common Exchequer Bill. The fact proved the truth of this assertion. The last division which ever took place in that House, in relation to the slave trade, was in the year 1805; and then the proposition for abolishing the slave-trade was actually thrown out by a majority. (*hear.*) In the very next year, Mr. Fox, who was then in office, came down to Parliament armed with all the powers of Government, and supported a similar proposition; the consequence was, that it was carried by a majority of ten to one. (*hear.*) Bad as that Parliament was, the country did owe to it some good-will; for in the very next Session the Slave Trade question was carried by a majority of 286 to 16; although but two years before, on the contrary, a majority voted in favour of that accursed traffic. (*hear, hear.*) How were men to explain these phenomena? Seeing this and that, what were they to say? The answer was, that the fate of a question depended upon the circumstances of its support. That support would be successful, if it was given by a Cabinet Minister; and the fate of a measure was certain in proportion as he was disposed to aid or to oppose it, his support being given in a way, that risked the tenure of his office. Now, the Noble Lord opposite could not upon all occasions use his most successful weapon—he could not always threaten, night after night, to go out of office for the sake of carrying a point; he could not one night be employing such a threat in order to gain a victory, and repeat it a second night. That was the most obvious thing in the world. But then how vast was the difference between the actually independent votes of Parliament and that imperfect, desultory, ragged sort of independence, as it might be called, which only thought and wished to vote out, or as it pleased, when the Minister happened, from any circumstances, to be tender of using "the whip," or of goading too much the most patient term of cattle that England ever saw. (*hear, hear, hear.*) It was only necessary for the House to look abroad—to see what changes had every where taken place—to observe the alterations in men and things—in order to learn not to despise the desires of the people; as judges of the terms on which the Members of that House were called upon to do their duty to the country; and the difference he spoke, of, he observed in nothing more than in this—that at length the people had taken a sober, a moderate—but not, on that account, a less steady or determined—view of the evils which had oppressed them for so many years; of the chances, amounting almost to a certainty of misgovernment within any given time in that period; of the necessity of providing almost the only remedy that could be applied to those evils; namely, a great reduction of office, and of the number of Placemen in the House of Parliament; and of reducing them as far as the necessities of the State might seem to require. And even after this too great a balance of Placemen would remain, to be compatible with the safety of the Constitution. The other and most direct remedy was to adopt a Parliamentary Reform—(*hear, hear*)—as the only means of bringing the representative into a more frequent communication with his constituents and to get rid of those overgrown establishments which now threatened to overturn the country and the constitution, that all of them had ever cherished with such ardent veneration. He had no hesitation to declare, that such establishments might be spared, and that the energies of the country might thus be preserved from that overwhelming ruin which those threatened to destroy, if the Parliament themselves were independent. (*cheers*) He did hope that this opportunity would be taken for giving a pledge to the country to this effect. It was to enable that House to regain with the country that confidence which only their own fault could have forfeited—it was to give them such an opportunity of evincing to the people that they were sensible of the existing evils and sympathised with their Representatives, that he should propose as a resolution—"That the influence now possessed by the Crown is unnecessary for maintaining its constitutional prerogatives, destructive of the independence of Parliament, and inconsistent with the well government of the State."

The Marquis of LONDONDERRY hoped he should receive the indulgence of the House while he endeavoured to follow the Honourable and Learned Member through his long and eloquent address. The Honourable and Learned Member commenced by observing, that the influence of the Crown had increased to the injury of the interests of the Country, and particularly as it affected the Parliament. It would, however, be for the House to decide how far that influence had been extended, either in Parliament or by other means. The Hon. and Learned Member had not only proposed a resolution, but expressed his determination to follow it up (if carried) by some remedial measure. What that remedial measure was to be the Honourable and Learned Member had not clearly stated;—it, however, slipped out in the conclusion of his speech (for which he thanked him), and what was it? Why nothing short of Parliamentary Reform. This was the question to which the Honourable

and Learned Member wished to pledge the House by his Resolution. (*hear, hear, hear.*) The Honourable and Learned Member had been defeated in various attacks, yet that was no reason why he should not return to the charge. Let him return; but if he did, let him meet the question fairly and openly, and not shelter his Parliamentary Reform under the weak disguise of a wish to reduce the influence of the Crown. (*hear, hear.*) Having said so much, he felt it necessary to observe, that he agreed with the Honourable and Learned Member in some points. He admitted that the influence of the Crown was just object of Parliamentary jealousy. But whatever that influence might be, he maintained that the House was composed of materials too sound and too durable to be acted upon or corrupted by it. The influence of the Crown might perhaps be excessive, if so, reduce it; but let the question of Reform, if at all introduced, be made a distinct and separate question. (*hear.*) The Honourable and Learned Member had taken the year 1780, and compared the influence of the Crown at that period with what it was at present. The Honourable and Learned Gentleman had compared the army and navy at the two periods; but he (Lord Londonderry) must be allowed to say, that the Honourable and Learned Member had not at all ventured to come to close quarters. The Honourable and Learned Member had, in the zeal of his argument, and with the energy of an advocate, indulged in certain figures and forms of speech, which were nothing else than rank and palpable exaggerations. The Noble Lord, after enlogising the perfect liberality and fairness with which the noble and illustrious persons at the head of the naval and military departments behaved to all officers, inasmuch that many, he was convinced, who were gallant officers sitting on the Opposition benches, would acknowledge that no difference was made between them and the warmest supporters of Ministers, proceeded to remark on the tone of exaggeration which pervaded most of the statements that had been made by the Honourable and Learned Gentleman in his speech. That Learned Gentleman had spoken of the expenditure of the present year, as being 28,000,000*l.* He (Lord Londonderry) did not know where the Honourable and Learned Gentleman had found his authorities; but he understood from his Right Honourable Friend (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) that he meant it to be (as would be stated on Friday, when the Budget would be brought forward), at the utmost not more than 18,000,000*l.* —(*hear, hear.*) But the Learned Gentleman then compared our military establishment with that of 1780, when, said he, we had only 33,000 men. Now, for guards and garrisons only, we certainly, in 1780, had 33,000 men; but the other troops on service made a total of 60,000 men, besides foreign troops who were serving and in our pay, at the time. The national expenditure, the Learned Gent. stated, in 1780, to have been 15,000,000*l.* Would the Hon. and Learned Gentleman, however, contrast the country, what it was now, with what it was forty years ago? Would he contrast the two periods in the state of our population and our wealth? (*hear.*) Let Gentlemen consider what the increase of population was, let them remember the increase of wealth, the increase of knowledge which had been infused into the public mind since that period; let them remember the tenets which the French Revolution and other circumstances had diffused over the face of the community—the vast increase in the power and influence of the public press—let all these be considered for a moment, and then would any Member stand up and state that the influence of the Crown had been increased, beyond, or even equal to its due proportion. (*hear, hear, hear.*) Would he compare the state of the public mind in 1780, and in the present year, when for the last twenty years it had been acted on by the history of the country (*hear, hear*), and by all those mischievous doctrines, growing out of the destructive ashes of the dangerous and pregnant phoenix of the French revolution? (*cries of hear, hear.*) The Noble Lord then went on to show that in the army and navy, the increase of patronage was as nothing compared with the increase of our force; and that in the colonial appointments the influence of the Crown had been vastly diminished by the Act of Parliament lately brought in (by Earl Bathurst, we believe.) Then, with respect to the collection of the revenue, the Hon. and Learned Gentleman had said—"Only think, what a source of patronage it must be to have a revenue of 50,900,000*l.*, which requires 4,000,000*l.* to defray the expenses of its collection." He had then gone on to show, that in 1780 we had a revenue of 15,000,000*l.* which was collected at an expense of 1,000,000*l.* Upon the principle laid down by the Honourable and Learned Gentleman, and looking at the proportion of the revenue at the two periods, the influence of the Crown, in this respect, was considerably diminished. As to the collection of the revenue, he (Lord Londonderry) had been furnished with returns of the Customs and Excise. The Customs returns were for the two years of 1797 and 1821. The favourite year of comparison was 1792; but the Custom-house records in that year having been burned, he was obliged to take the next he could find, namely, 1797. In that year the persons employed in the customs were 5,728 in number; in 1821, they were 6,864. So that more than 1,000 was the difference in the number of individuals employed to collect the revenue in the two periods. But the revenue in 1821 amounted to 11,500,000*l.* whereas, in 1797, it only amounted to 6,000,000*l.*; conse-

quently the revenue was nearly doubled in amount, while the number of persons employed in its collection was increased only one sixth. It was perhaps proper to mention that 410 officers less than the number in 1797 were now employed in the Customs. The general increase had grown out of the quarantine and other establishments. In 1797, the salaries amounted to 418,000*l.*; in 1821, to 638,000*l.*; so that there was an increase of about one-third in the expense of collection. The total number of officers in the Excise was 4,693, in 1792, and 5,655, in 1821. The salaries in 1792 were 318,000*l.*; in 1822, 638,000*l.*; but the increase of the revenue had been in this proportion:—In 1792, it was 8,120,000*l.*; now it was 24,647,000*l.*—so that there was an increase of about 16,000,000*l.* sterling. Instead of promoting patronage, the efforts of Parliament had been a long time to reduce it. Upon many occasions the Legislature had for shown a laudable anxiety to narrow and reduce the patronage of Ministers and of the Crown. The Officers in the Customs, for instance, were now under very different rules from those by which they were formerly regulated. Those offices were not conferred on persons merely for the purpose of extending Ministerial influence. The system now adopted was to place individuals in those situations whose merits would bear the test of rigid examination. When the Hon. and Learned Gentleman talked of "the long arm of the Treasury" reaching every class of individuals in this country, he defied him to prove his assertion. The very reverse of the Honourable and Learned Gentleman's statement was the fact. The Honourable and Learned Gentleman had contended, that the influence of the Crown had increased because the revenue had increased. Did he mean to say that the influence of the Crown was extended because the debt of the country was enlarged? He (Lord Londonderry) had already referred to the Customs—he would next notice the Excise. In doing so he must observe that there was as decided a control kept over that branch of the public service at present as there ever was at any antecedent period; and he was prepared to maintain that it did not, in any way, tend to swell the influence of the Crown. The Honourable and Learned Gentleman had contended, most strenuously, that the influence of the Crown must be increased, because the revenue of the country was increased. In endeavouring to support this position, he had alluded to Exchequer processes—he had entered into a learned law argument, relieved by a variety of jokes—in short, he had resorted to every means in his power to show that the interest of the debt was a matter of positive influence in the hands of the Crown. The Honourable and Learned Gentleman had called for some information on this subject, and he (Lord Londonderry) was sorry that the whole of it had not been laid on the table. That part of it, however, which had been produced, contradicted the statement of the Honourable and Learned Gentleman. Since he had entered the House, he saw the returns from one part of the empire, and he should have been glad of those connected with the other portions of the state had also been produced. The Honourable and Learned Gentleman seemed to suppose, that because the revenue had increased and the legal processes had increased, that, therefore, the influence of the Crown was extended. The fact was not so—and the Honourable and Learned Gentleman must be aware that the power formerly intrusted to the Attorney-General on this point had been contracted. Did his Honourable and Learned Friend, the Attorney-General, feel any jealousy as to the restriction of that power? Assuredly he did not. And the Bill which had been brought in a few years ago, for the regulation of this department of the public service, if it had not received the approbation of the Hon. and learned Gent. was certainly supported by those who surrounded him. It was then said, and he believed by the Hon. and Learned Gent. himself, that if there were not some check on the operation of the revenue-laws, they would be intolerable, either in this or any other country. Now he believed it would be found, contrary to the statement of the Hon. and Learned Gentleman, that the Exchequer processes, so far from having increased, had actually decreased. The taxes throughout the country were never collected with the aid of less legal process than had been resorted to in the last two years, and particularly in the year which had recently elapsed. The Exchequer processes, issued in Scotland between 1800 and 1810, amounted to more than 5,000, whereas, in the last ten years they were about 500 under that number. The Hon. and Learned Gentleman must, therefore, if he wished to raise an argument on the increased influence of the Crown, by a reference to the supposed extension of Exchequer processes, connected with the collection of the revenue, revise his information. He did not mean to go into a history of all the Exchequer laws. He knew that their operation must necessarily be severe. He would not draw the attention of the House to the "facious difficulties" with which the Hon. and Learned Gent. had described them to be surrounded. But he must observe, that if those laws were severe and imperfect, it would form a very good ground for applying to Parliament to have them altered, but that circumstance ought not to be brought forward as an argument for a very different purpose. The Hon. and Learned Gentleman next came to the influence of the Crown, as it appeared in Parliament. The Hon. and Learned Gent. stated, that he was prepared to answer the observation which would

probably be made, that the number of placemen in Parliament was never so small as it was at present. He then went on to state, that there were eighty Placemen now in Parliament. Here again he (Lord Londonderry) must say, that no materials which he possessed enabled him to agree with the Honourable and Learned Gentleman in his conclusion. There were not, he believed, more than 47 or 48 persons in Parliament who held offices under the Crown, to which the Hon. and Learned Gentleman could fairly attach influence. To swell out the number of placemen in that House to the amount the Honourable and Learned Gentleman had stated, it would be necessary for him to press several Gentlemen from the stores by which he was surrounded. The Honourable Member for Calne (Mr. J. Macdonald,) held a situation under the Crown; so also did the Honourable Member for Bath, and the Honourable Member for Peterborough. These Gentlemen were, he supposed, paraded on the present occasion. But on looking at these troops, if it were necessary to muster them, they would be found, he believed, not to prove that monstrous and overgrown influence of the Crown which savoured of destruction to the Constitution. He never had complained, and he never would complain, of a just and salutary jealousy in that House on the subject of royal influence; but he must always oppose exaggerated statements, however boldly they might be put forth. He now felt it his duty to call the attention of the House to the conduct of that reviled Parliament which the Hon. and Learned Gentleman had condemned in such strong terms. He apprehended that the Honourable and Learned Gentleman might have laid his motion much deeper than he had done—he might have gone much further back, seeing that his object was not to regulate the influence of the Crown, but to effect a complete alteration of the present Parliamentary system. He ought not to have confined himself to the period when Mr. Pitt came into office, nor to the time when Lord Sidmouth succeeded Mr. Pitt; he ought to have gone beyond the year 1780, and endeavoured to show, by a comparison with what then occurred, that the present Parliament was corrupt and bad. But what had been the conduct of Parliament during the whole period to which the Hon. and Learned Gent. had alluded. Had it not proceeded on the principle of restraining within due bounds, the whole influence of the Crown so far as it had any tendency to be employed for corrupt purposes? Had not Parliament endeavoured as much as possible, to contract the expenditure of the public money? And had they not brought it within much narrower bounds than the Hon. and Learned Gent. had stated? (hear.) The last 40 years was an era during which many great and signal transactions had occurred. The expenses of the Crown, and consequently its influence, had, in that period, been contracted and regulated. It was true that Mr. Burke's Bill did not prove successful. But the spirit in which that Bill was conceived, was assiduously kept alive, and the consequence was that Mr. Burke's Bill was followed up by a number of efficient measures. Did the Hon. and Learned Gentleman consider that there was no change in the system, when his late Right Hon. Friend Mr. Pitt, placed the finance of the country on a new footing? He altered the system under which previously the creatures of Government received the donations of the Crown through the influence of the ministers. (hear hear.) He threw open the competition for Loans in which the Bank of England saw fair play between the Crown and the Public. All the Contracts for the State, for victualing the Navy, for taking up transports, which were before settled in the private room of the Minister, Mr. Pitt caused to be thrown open. He had those contracts superintended by boards, and effected on the principle of open competition. Was this no criterion to show that the revenue of the Crown and its influence had been scrupulously watched? One of the most remarkable eras in the history of the country, with reference to its internal reform, had been alluded to by the Hon. and Learned Gent.; and he must say, that the Hon. and Learned Gentleman had misunderstood every thing which Mr. Rose had stated on the subject. Mr. Rose, he said, had published that 400 or 500 offices had been reduced, but that 1500 had been created. Now what Mr. Rose had really stated was, that 450 offices had been reduced, and that 200 and odd offices had been created. These, however, it should be observed, were mere menial offices in the revenue, connected with its collection. But the offices excluded, from the operation of Mr. Burke's Bill, the tenor of which was followed by the Marq. of Lansdown, when he was in the Treasury, were of a very different description. There were 300 of those offices all of them of that description to which a minister would look for the purpose of maintaining a corrupt influence. In 1804, Mr. Pitt abolished 196 sinecure offices, which had previously cost the country 42,000*l.* a year; and offices of that kind the Hon. and Learned Gent. must admit were more likely than any others to secure Parliamentary influence. The Hon. and Learned Gent. had alleged that offices had increased in proportion to the increase of the revenue. The reverse of this statement was the fact. The revenue had indeed increased; but there was by no means an equal increase of offices. Notwithstanding the increase of the revenue, upwards of 300 offices had been reduced. A much smaller number had been created, and those were of that description which were actually

necessary for the administration of the system. What had been the conduct of his Majesty's Ministers since those situations were reduced? To that he would advert presently, always requesting it to be borne in mind that a time of peace was the proper period for examining the spirit by which the Government was animated. Before he came to that period he would refer to an intervening year, when the Honourable Member for Corfe Castle made an elaborate inquiry into the state of the finances of the country. He entered minutely into the constitution of all those offices which Mr. Burke did not think it necessary to meddle with, because he thought them essential to the Government. He left them untouched, knowingly and willingly, with his eyes open. He did so on a principle which he avowed in his celebrated speech on the subject. But such was the growing temper for reform in that House, that an inquiry was instituted into the nature, uses, and emoluments of those offices; and many years did not elapse until the whole system of sinecure offices was expunged from the Government of the country. So that, when the question of abolishing one of the joint postmasters-general was brought forward a few nights since, the Hon. Member for Corfe Castle justified his vote in favour of that proposition, on the ground that it was the only office under Government that could be denominated a sinecure. Two hundred offices in England, Scotland, and Ireland, had been abolished, exclusive of 100 of a minor nature, which came within the Civil List of the Crown, and had been suppressed within a comparatively short period. He knew it might be said, that a corresponding authority was granted to the Crown by an additional sum of money that was voted to it. But this was not the fact. The offices suppressed cost the country 57,000*l.* a year, whereas the sum voted was only 30,000*l.* per ann. Amongst the offices reduced were, the Warden of the Cinque-ports, the Chief Justice in Eyre, &c., and in lieu of them a certain number of pensions were granted. No less than 39 of the offices thus reduced were compatible with a seat in Parliament, and those by whom they were possessed had held seats in that House during the last ten years of the Parliamentary history of this country. The result of the retrenchment consequent on the reduction of offices which took place conformably with the address of last year, might be collected from the official returns. His Right Hon. Friend (Mr. Vansittart) means to take credit, this year, on account of the reduction of those offices, for a saving of 150,000*l.* It was unnecessary for him to enter into a detailed statement on this subject. He would only observe, that, from the close of the war, up to the period of the address of last year, the Government had completely examined the whole system of the country for the purpose of seeing what offices could be suppressed or regulated in a more beneficial manner. He held in his hand a list of every office that existed at present, as well as of those that had been reduced. He would content himself with stating the result to the House, because it would be very easy for any gentleman who wished it, to procure documents which would give him the most minute information on the subject. The result, then, was, that from the close of the war up to the period of the address of last year, 1,699 offices were reduced, and the individuals holding them were dismissed, making a saving of 360,000*l.* This, it should be observed, was exclusive of the offices suppressed at the time the Hon. Members for Corfe Castle brought forward his proposition, which had the effect of reducing offices that cost the country 220,000*l.* a year. So that there had been a reduction between the conclusion of the war and the time of the address last year, of 2,812 offices, and a consequent saving of 580,000*l.* Besides this, there was a subsequent reduction of offices to the amount of 150,000*l.* making a total saving of 730,000*l.* (hear) He admitted that much remained to be done, and he could assure the House that no wish was entertained by Ministers not to push reform to every practicable and commendable extent—(hear.) He was sure the truth of this assertion would be allowed, when he stated, that with the exception of the Customs, there was not a single department connected with the receipt or expenditure of the revenue in Great Britain and Ireland, that was not, at present, subject to a strict inquiry, not by persons appointed by the Ministers of the Crown, but by commissioners appointed by Parliament, and acting under the sanction of an oath. (hear.) If he could show that proceedings of this kind had been, and were, in progress, he conceived that it would be an ample justification not merely of Ministers, but of that Parliament which the Hon. and Learned Gentleman reviled. Yes that reviled Parliament, much as the Hon. and Learned Gentleman seemed to despise it, had saved not only this country but the civilised world. (hear, hear, from the Opposition Benches, loudly re-echoed by the friends of Ministers.) If he could prove that such was the fact, the House, he was inclined to think, would not agree in that sentence of condemnation for which the Hon. and Learned Gentleman had called. If he could show that, for the last 40 years, every attempt had been made, and not unsuccessfully, to keep down the influence of the Crown, to retrench the public expenditure, and to watch narrowly over the issue of the public money, he should, he thought, go a good way towards rescuing Parliament and the Ministers of the Crown from the censure of the Hon. and Learned Gent. (hear, hear.) The Hon. and Learned Gent. appeared, indeed, much more anxious to accuse and vituperate the Parliament than the Government. For the purpose of impeaching Par-

liament, he had quoted various transactions which had happened during the last 20 years, and he had condemned in severe terms the course which that House had pursued with reference to particular measures. He had, more especially, alluded to the proceedings that had taken place relative to the Malt Tax, which he seemed to think indicative of the corrupt state of the representation. But if the Malt Tax were repealed in a very thin House, was it not the duty of Ministers to introduce the question when there was a more full attendance of Members? If he (Lord Londonderry) should ever have the good fortune to persuade the House to adopt any particular measure, would not the Hon. and Learned Gentleman take the most favourable opportunity to resist, and, if possible, to defeat that measure? If such a plan were good for one side of the House, assuredly it must be good for both. The Hon. and Learned Gentleman could not suppose that a privilege of that kind—the privilege of selecting the best opportunity for effecting a particular object—belonged only to himself and his friends. It was perfectly clear from all that had been said by the Hon. and Learned Gentleman, that Parliamentary Reform, and nothing else, was the end and object of his motion. He seemed to have no other view save that of degrading—not the present House of Commons, which he appeared to hold in perfect respect—but every House of Commons that had preceded it for many years. He (Lord Londonderry) was not prepared to go through all the historical matter which the Honourable and Learned Gentleman had introduced. His invective was not directed against Parliament because they had supported the present Ministers for many years, but because they had generally supported that system which he conscientiously believed had wrought the salvation of the country. (hear.) He was yet to learn that that House ought to nominate the Ministers of the Crown. For his own part, he thought it was the bounden duty of Members of that House to support the Minister of the Crown for the time being. (cries of "hear," from the Opposition.) It was in consequence of the support which Ministers had received from the Legislature, this country had been enabled to keep up a successful struggle against the acts of revolutionary Governments, and had been enabled to meet the machinations of some of the infatuated subjects of this country. Steady in the march he had described, Government, had adopted every practicable measure for meliorating the state of the country. Every reasonable man must perceive, that it had gone along with those principles which were bound up with every thing that was valuable to the people of this country with every thing that was essential to the liberties of Europe. This reviled Parliament, which the Hon. and Learned Member would degrade to-night, for the purpose of bringing it to some of those standards which he thought better than the present, had done its duty to the empire. It was not the sarcasms of the Honourable and Learned Gentleman, nor his gloomy forebodings, nor his vehement attacks against the Minister of the day, that could divert the Parliament of the country from that great career of principle, of interest, and of glory, which it was pursuing. He would maintain, in the face of all the charges the Hon. and Learned Gent. had made against Parliament, as unworthy of the confidence of the country, and unfit to administer its affairs, that it had conducted this empire, most successfully, through a crisis fraught with public difficulty and danger. It had by wisdom, by its firmness and by its prudence, saved this country from ruin, and rescued the remainder of Europe from hopeless slavery. He, therefore, would never stand by and hear the Parliament of England calumniated after the glorious acts which it had achieved. (hear.) He called on the House this night to oppose the resolution of the Hon. and Learned Gent. He would warn them, that the Hon. and Learned Gentleman had not introduced it for the purpose of effecting the repeal of a few petty Bills, nor was his object the reduction of one or two offices, neither was his intention confined to preventing a few placemen from sitting in that House. No, he looked far beyond these trifling points; and if he carried his motion, he would on some other occasion, come down to the House and say, "I should not act up to the principles I laid down, if I rested here. I feel that I should deceive you, if I said, that any thing I have done towards excluding placemen, from this House was sufficient. Nothing has been done, so long as this guilty Parliament, this nuisance, which poisons the source of our prosperity, is suffered to exist. Be true to yourselves, and to the interests of the public, (hear, hear,) and effect that reform of Parliament for which you have laid the basis, by agreeing to my resolution." (hear, hear.) He protested solemnly against the motion of the Hon. and Learned Gent. because he had proposed one thing, while, in fact, he meant another. He wished to sap the foundation of the character of Parliament, knowing that, if the House were base enough to sign its own dishonour, a dissolution of the present system must inevitably follow. (hear, hear.) He hoped, therefore, that the House would immediately pass to the other orders of the day, and not give any countenance whatsoever to the proposition. (hear, hear.) He called on the House the more earnestly to do this, because he gave them not merely his conscientious assurance (which would undoubtedly be a weak ground for them to act upon), but the evidence which was placed on their table, that at the present moment measures were in progress to search and

investigate every office to which the idea of influence could be attached, for the purpose of placing it on the most economical footing. Those offices would be placed on grounds very different from those on which they had formerly stood; and he now gave to the House the best pledge he could that Ministers would not relax in their efforts to introduce a system of rigid economy. More, much more, would be done, without agreeing to a resolution, which if acted on, would have the effect of shaking off the best interests of the Empire.—(hear, hear.) His Lordship concluded by moving as an amendment, "that the other orders of the day be now read."

Mr. H.G. BENNET said he rose to address the House with considerable diffidence, after the eloquent and argumentative speech of his Hon. and Learned Friend, and the able speech, for so he must call it, of the Noble Lord. The Noble Lord had assumed pretty nearly the same tone which one of his predecessors had adopted when Mr. Dunning brought forward his celebrated motion. But what was the answer of that House to the Minister who was then at the head of the Government? The answer then given was the same which ought now to be given. The Minister was left in a minority by the House of Commons. The country found that the interest of the Crown, in every department of the State, was too strong for the interest of the people, and therefore the House of Commons agreed to the proposition. The Noble Lord had gone through the different departments of the State, and he (Mr. Bennet) deemed it necessary to go through some of them. What, he would ask, was the amount of revenue at present collected? He did not look so much to the amount, as to the expense of its collection, and the influence necessarily connected with it. In 1792 the expense of collection was little more than 1,000,000*l.*; in 1822, it was between 4,000,000*l.* and 5,000,000*l.* Was it not, therefore, impossible to deny that the influence of the Crown had increased in the same ratio? There were some where between 18 and 20,000 civil officers, whom the Crown nominated and paid, and who were directly under its influence. Now would any one be hardy enough to contend, that such an extensive patronage as this might not be used for corrupt purposes? It was a mere joke to suppose that Ministers looked about for persons who appeared to be the best fitted to fill this or that office; and that no unworthy solicitations were ever made or attended to, when a place happened to be vacant. How the Noble Lord could assert this in the presence of so many individuals who knew the contrary—of persons, the object of whose frequent visits to the Treasury could not be mistaken, surprised him not a little. The Noble Lord challenged any Member of that House to show in what instance the long arm of the Treasury was stretched forth to exert any improper influence. Now, he would, for example, point out two instances. One of these was the post office. He happened to have some knowledge of the system of administration there. He knew that in 1789 the patronage of that department was entirely in the hands of the Postmaster-General. Now, however, it was wholly and entirely in the hands of the Treasury, and the Postmaster-General had no more to do with it than he had. In the department of the customs, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, there were about 9,000 persons. There was in fact, a large army in the customs and excise—a body equal in number to the standing army which was kept up in this country in the good old times. Was there not also an immense increase of influence in the naval and military department? The Noble Lord thought, perhaps, that the spirit of persecution, which formerly prevailed, on account of political opinions, did not now exist. But he could point out to the Noble Lord persons whose military services entitled them to honours and rewards, and who would have received those honours and rewards, if they had sat on the Ministerial side, instead of taking their stations on his side of the House. The Noble Lord asked, "Do you think the political conduct of individuals operated against them in the eyes of Ministers?" He would say, "Yes;" and he would tell the Noble Lord why he thought so. He did not mean to build his opinion on the case of his Honourable Friend, the Member for Southwark, base and scandalous as was the treatment he had received. No—his opinion was founded on the fact disclosed by the papers laid on their table, from which it appeared that, since the year 1793, no less than 939 officers had dismissed the service without trial, and, he would say, almost without accusation. So much for the influence of the Crown; and it was impossible that such an exertion of power should fail to have an influence. The true proposition which his Hon. and Learned Friend had made out was this, that the expenditure of the Government had increased. The Noble Lord had alluded to Mr. Rose's pamphlet, to show that in former times there were more placemen in Parliament. Mr. Rose was not very remarkable for the accuracy of his statements; he had asserted, it was true, that in 1762 there were 96 persons in the House who held places, but on what authority he Mr. Bennet had been unable to find, though he had attempted to do so. An he answered for was, that 87 persons were now in the House who held places, though some of the places were merely honorary—as King's Counsel, King's Sergeant, &c. Yet even these were valuable in a professional way. The 87 persons had amongst them 163,000*l.*;

there were moreover 73 persons holding military and naval commissions, a number greater than was ever known before. It was evident, too, from the words of the questions in the resolutions of former times against placemen in the House, that Members holding commissions were included in that description. Another point of view in which it was not possible to avoid putting the question of the influence of the Crown, was its influence through the Church? That reverend body always, perhaps from good motives, went with the Crown, even in matters in which it should seem difficult for any persons, having religious feelings, to follow it. Not speaking of the establishment of Ireland, (where the Nobility parcelled out the lands of the kingdom among the younger branches of their families, under the names of bishops and archbishops, where there was a church of 500,000 Protestants, with a body of ecclesiastics richer even than those of Spain had been—a body of ecclesiastics having less to do, and more to receive, than any in the world,) there were in England alone, in the gift of the Crown—two archbishops, twenty-four bishops, thirty-eight deaneries, forty-six prebends, and 1,020 livings. He would ask whether the gift of this enormous patronage had not necessarily an immense effect on the country. He would call attention to what had been done by the Crown in the purchase of that House. The great creation of Peers during the last 29 years had been persons brought out of that House on account of the number of seats which they held there, and which they left to be occupied by their nominees. In 1780 there were 225 Peers; and in the discussion on the influence of the Crown, it was asserted by the late Lord Liverpool, that this number was rather fewer than they were in 1760. At the present moment there were 378. (*hear.*) It might be curious to compare some particular ranks of the Peerage at the two periods. In 1780 there was but one Marquis, now there were 18. In 1780 there were 78 Earls, now 109. There were in 1780, 65 Barons, now 142. It was to be remarked that this last numerous class was the first step from this to the other House. If they went through the great batches of Peers made during the war with France, they would find that in the great majority of instances, the consideration had been political services in that House—the voting for the ministry, or the filling of seats with those whom might vote for them. (*hear.*) The Noble Lord had made a general panegyric on the Parliament; but he had found it difficult to follow his Honourable and Learned Friend through the specific instances of the degradation of the House of Commons—of their voting against a proposition one day, and turning round at the beck of the minister to vote for it the next; voting in favour of a man when he was Minister, and leaving him in a minority the moment he had left office. The Noble Lord had not adverted to the time when Pitt, Fox, and Windham, all the able men in the House, were sitting on one side of the House, and opposed to the weakest and most confessedly imbecile Government that had ever existed in the country. The House of Commons stood by that Government, and after having supposed Mr. Pitt while in office, by overwhelming majorities, left him, when he opposed Mr. Addington, in a minority, in the proportion of one to four. When the Noble Lord praised the conduct of the Parliament during the last war, why did we not look to the general result? They had found the country a garden of Eden, and left it a wilderness of desolation. The agricultural interest was reduced, as the Noble Lord acknowledged, to beggary and ruin. The commercial interest was reduced almost to the same condition, and the colonial interest was in a state of confessed bankruptcy. The condition of the country called for a reform in the House of Commons. He agreed with his Hon. and Learned Friend, that there were two ways of reforming the House, the one was to get rid of the pensioners and placemen in the House; for when they look back to the bits of divisions, they would find that the votes of disputed millions of the public money had been decided by the votes of the paid servants or the Crown. The other was a reform in the mode in which Members were returned to that House. Without that change, it was to little purpose for his Hon. and Learned Friend, as far as that House was concerned, to make those speeches which were so well calculated to instruct and enlighten; he well knew that they were all as waste paper, unless a cheap Government made a Reform in Parliament.

Mr. S. WORTLEY said, if the bill of indictment against the House of Commons, which had been preferred by the Hon. and Learned Gentleman, and the Hon. Gentleman who had spoken last, was a true one, he would become a Reformer, and the sooner they began a Reform the better. (*hear.*) He asserted, however, that the charge of the House of Commons had been made on false grounds, as the Hon. and Learned Gentleman had assumed reasons for the votes of the House, which, if he read the history of this country, he might be sure were not the real ones. The motion of the Honourable and Learned Gentleman, professing to be for the reduction of the influence in the Crown, really did nothing to that end, but went direct to Parliamentary Reform, as did also the speech of an Hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bennet) who had heretofore proposed measures for the reduction of that influence. (*hear, hear, from the opposition.*) He thanked the Gentlemen for this admission, and he would say that there was no need of a Reform in Parliament, (*hear, hear, hear, from the opposition.*) and that if they did not mean to destroy the Monarchy, yet the Reform must lead to its destruction. (*hear, hear, hear.*) If the influence of the Crown was strong

in that House they should recollect that it was strong elsewhere; that on all important questions the House of Lords had gone with the Commons, except on one important occasion, when the House of Commons, having attempted to dictate to the whole country, had been successfully resisted by the House of Lords, supported by the people. To come to close quarters with the Hon. and Learned Gent.; he had said that the House of Commons having supported Mr. Pitt, when in office, had, when Mr. Addington was Minister, supported him by large majorities against Mr. Pitt. The fact was undoubtedly true, but he denied that the inference was correct. The circumstances should be considered, Mr. Pitt having by his influence, and almost direct nomination placed Mr. Addington as Prime Minister for some reasons which no doubt were satisfactory to himself turned round and opposed him, he Mr. S. Wortley had said then as he said now, that Mr. Pitt gave no reason to the House of Commons to withdraw the confidence they had placed. The House of Commons was not to appoint Ministers of the Crown; it was the business of the House of Lords to deliberate on the measures proposed to it, and then only to withdraw its confidence from the Ministers when their measures showed them to be undeserving of it. It was said that only 60 persons, voted with Mr. Pitt, against Mr. Addington and for a very good reason, no one voted with Mr. Pitt on that question but his personal friends. The adherents of Mr. Fox for the most part (Mr. Sheridan among them), who were in the habit of attacking the then Administration for its imbecility, yet voted against the motion of Mr. Pitt. It ill became those, therefore, who professed to succeed to the party of Mr. Fox to make the conduct of the majority in that division a ground of blame to the House of Commons. At the death of Mr. Pitt, the Government of the country devolved, he might say naturally, on Mr. Fox; he was the great rival of Mr. Pitt, and led the opinions of a great political party. Having entered office, the House of Commons would not have done right if they had not allowed him a fair chance. He [Mr. S. W.] thought it a most improper act to put the Chief Justice of the King's Bench in the Cabinet, and he had been among those who voted against it; but he well remembered how slightly the matter was treated by Mr. Fox, who declared, that if he was to have an Opposition, he hoped they would always take their stand on such a point as that! The Honourable and Learned Gentleman had then talked of the turning of the House of Commons against the same Ministry, when they were put out of office for having proposed a measure which had been since passed *sub silentio*.—He should remember, however, the circumstances of the case. The idea was that the Ministry of that day had been determined to press that measure in spite of the scruples of the King—the King having then found it necessary to get rid of them, the question was, whether they should not allow another Ministry to carry on the Government. He would say more, the people were in favour of the Ministry that succeeded them—a fact which the cry of 'No Popery,' whatever might be said of those who raised it, sufficiently proved. He now came to the Walcheren expedition, and in that case he (Mr. S. W.) was in the majority, and was a culprit if there was any criminality. They should remember the circumstances. The time was just after the battle of Talavera, and the impression among the people was, that the Gentleman opposite him, if they displaced the Ministry, would not prosecute war in Spain with the vigour that was desired.—Those Gentlemen had rather shewn exultation at the failure of that expedition, the conduct of which was, no doubt, highly blameable. (*hear, hear.*) But it became the House of Commons to consider the effect, and if the ulterior results might be mischievous, the House did right to support the Government. (*hear, from the opposition.*) He was prepared for these cheers. Did not the Hon. Gentleman themselves often in their votes look not merely to the question before them, but to the circumstances that preceded and followed them? A most extraordinary charge on the House was that for its conduct on the Salt Tax, because at one time this Session it voted to continue the tax, and some time after on the motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, it voted its repeal. Was a first vote always to be taken as a deliberate vote? In the case of the Postmasters General, on the first vote the House supported the offices—but having taken time to consider, they voted for the reduction. He himself was in the majority against the first motion, and for the second. The House was taken by surprise on the first motion respecting the Salt Tax. In like manner, in 1812, he had thought that the death of Mr. Perceval was a death-blow to the Administration, and he had persuaded a majority of the House of Commons to vote an Address for the formation of a new Ministry. The Prince Regent thus naturally addressed himself to the leaders of the Opposition party, and was met with what he must now say were very unreasonable propositions on their parts. In three weeks the country was tired of this state of things and thought any Government better than none. He (Mr. Stuart Wortley) again endeavoured to enforce his proposition, but the mind of the House had been changed; he had himself thought, that the Opposition had become so pledged to the war in Spain, that they were no longer to be considered dangerous as a Government. He might now tell the Honourable Gentlemen (*the Opposition*) that if the country had had confidence in

them, they would have been in office more than once. (*hear, hear.*) But they had not only lost the confidence of those who were opposed to their principles, but they were outbid in popularity by others, who were willing to go greater lengths than they could promise.—He would not use the words of Mr. Windham, that they “pandered to the base passions of the people;” but he would say, that so long as they attempted to take advantage of the prejudices of the ignorant, they would not have the confidence of the sound part of the country. They now assumed much on Parliamentary Reform; and he (Mr. S. W.) saw the temper of the people was with them. (*hear.*) But there was a remedy, which he should be glad if they would apply—frequent discussion of the question there and elsewhere. The oftener the question was discussed, the sooner, he was convinced, would the people come back to good sense on the question, and see that their safety was in the continuance of the present constitution of the House of Commons. (*hear.*)

Mr. PEEL rose to rescue his constituents from an unjust imputation. The distinguished body which he represented (the University of Oxford) might refer for an answer to the general imputation to their general conduct; as to the particular facts mentioned by the Honourable and Learned Gentleman, they did not bear out the specific charges. These charges, he understood, were founded on the election of Lord Grenville, as Chancellor, at a particular period; the other, on their allowing a measure to pass in silence in 1817, which they had protested against in 1807.—When they looked at the high character of Lord Grenville—to his attachment to our Ecclesiastical Establishment—his general line of policy—his opposition to the principles which had marked the early part of the French war; when they remembered the station he had held in the University, as one of her most distinguished scholars; and as a member on the foundation of one of the most illustrious of her societies; and when they considered that his opponent was Lord Eldon, the Lord Chancellor, the learned body that chose him stood sufficiently vindicated both as to the object and as to the motives of their choice. (*hear.*) As to the measure which they opposed in 1807, it was not precisely the same as that which passed in 1817, but if it had been, the circumstances were changed? the conscientious feelings of his late Majesty had been against that measure, and many of those who now zealously advocated the claims of the Catholics, had, up to the death of the King, been on that account professedly adverse to them. He apologised for having said thus much in reply to a part of the Hon. and Learned Gentleman's speech, which he had not himself heard, and he hoped the affection and regard which he naturally bore to the body which had conferred on him a distinguished honour, would be his sufficient excuse. (*hear, hear.*)

Mr. WETHERELL defended the conduct of the University of Oxford; the Hon. Member's observations were, for the most part, so inaudible as to render an accurate report of them impracticable.

Mr. BROUGHAM briefly replied. The Right Honourable Gentleman (Mr. Peel) was naturally anxious to preserve the reputation of those who sent him there to represent them, but he had been misinformed as to the nature of the remarks on their conduct. He (Mr. Brougham) had not blamed them for choosing Lord Grenville. Quite the contrary. He had said that Lord Grenville was a very fit and proper person, for some of those very reasons urged by the Right Honourable Gentleman. But he (Mr. B.) did think that in spite of all his natural and acquired talents, and of other qualities, all of which in his opinion should be recommendations (but some of which were more likely to be disqualifications at Oxford,) if it were not for his near approach to power, Lord Grenville would not have been elected—an opinion he had never heard disputed till that night, by his Learned Friend Mr. Wetherell, we believe. This observation of his was not so wide as it was represented to be of the question, as it shewed the influence of the Crown out of doors as well as in doors, and the magnitude of the power it was their business to limit. As to the Bill of 1807, they opposed it not on the score of the King's conscience, but its own merits. He complained much less of those who yielded to those scruples, unconstitutional as such a compliance was, than of those who raised the cry of “No Popery,” carrying as much for Popery as for the King's conscience, and as much for the King's conscience as for the opinions of William the Conqueror. The Hon. and Learned Gent. then alluded to the remarks of Mr. Wortley. It was the doctrine of the Hon. member for Yorkshire, that it was the duty of the House of Commons to give its confidence to any Ministers till they had proposed some measures that proved them to be unworthy of confidence. This he denied—it was the duty of the House of Commons to be satisfied as to the fitness of the persons, before, by their misgovernment they had led the country into misfortunes. During the last war, the country was, as it were, struggling for life, when France was thundering at our gates, and when the country was torn by civil and religious dissensions. If it was proper at such a time for the House of Commons to wait till the Country was plunged in utter ruin, he had read the Constitution bill (*hear, hear.*)—it was a doctrine that had been often departed from, and never more than at the end of the American war.—(*hear, hear.*) The Noble Lord had said that he had indirectly censured the House. He did

not know the amount of vituperation which would satisfy the Noble Lord (*a laugh.*) He thought he had been open to the charge of being ill understood.—(*Lord Londonderry said a few words across the table.*)—Then the Noble Lord was satisfied; he was glad of it. (*a laugh.*) He had admired the Noble Lord's skill; he had left all the sore places untouched, and gently covered them in general panegyric. A more lame and impotent defence than that set up, he (Mr. B.) had never heard. The question was not merely respecting places and offices in that House. From that source much influence arose which was felt in the deliberations and votes of that House. But there was a large debt: for the payment of the interest of that debt a large amount of money must be yearly levied. The collection and expenditure of that money necessarily conferred influence upon the Crown. To meet that influence, a counterpoise was required. If they would preserve the balance of the constitution, they must introduce changes on the one side equivalent to the changes created on the other, in order to prevent any alteration of the system. Changes had been created by the debt and its machinery; changes were therefore necessary to be placed on the opposite side of the beam, in order to restore the equipoise. (*hear.*) The Members of that House must therefore be brought more into contact with their constituents, in order to give to the people the counterpoise required by the principles of the Constitution against the influence of the Crown. He called upon the House, if they valued the good will and confidence of the country, to restore this counterpoise; but if they turned a deaf ear to the voice of the people, the consequence would be well-founded dissatisfaction, and all the evils which must arise from an entire derangement of our boasted Constitution. This, he said, not as a menace, but he stated it as the precaution which experience dictated. If they should now be obdurate, it might hereafter be too late to attempt what might now be an effectual remedy. It was the part of sound wisdom to look a little before them, and to act in unison with the feelings and interests of the people, as many former Parliaments had kept in view every gratification not of the people, but of the Ministers of the Crown.

The House then divided:

For the Motion, 101—Against it, 216—Majority, 115.

The other Orders and Notices were then disposed of, and the House adjourned at Half-past Twelve.

### John Bull Newspaper.

To the Editor of the Courier.

Sir, Permit me, through the medium of your Paper, to offer a few observations relating to some malicious and undesired attacks made upon me on various occasions in the JOHN BULL Newspaper. Nearly a twelvemonth has now elapsed since the Editors of that Paper circulated and published a report, that a man of the name of Haywood was at my house in Tavistock-square, when his Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex honoured me with his presence. I solemnly declare, that I never knew of the existence of that unfortunate man, but through the medium of the press; yet the Editors had the cruelty to call him my especial friend. What could have been their motive for publishing a statement so base, false, and malicious, is best known to themselves. I was in hopes that common justice would have prompted them to contradict the libel, and make the *amende honorable*. They have done no such thing; on the contrary, they have availed themselves of every opportunity to assail me with ill-nature and obloquy. A few days since an inflated and ridiculous paragraph, appeared in some of the Morning Papers, professing to give an account of a dinner party I had the honour of giving to some distinguished individuals, called forth again the spleen of the JOHN BULL newspaper. Were I capable of writing or countenancing such an absurd account as that I allude to, I should indeed conceive myself to be justly an object of ridicule. I have not the faintest idea who could have sent the paragraph in question. I am not such a vain fool as to think my giving a party at Finchley or elsewhere, ought to be published and bruted forth. When I read the account in the Papers, I was extremely mortified, as my friends can testify. I never in my life wrote or sent a puff to any newspaper. If the Proprietors of the JOHN BULL can, by abusing me, enhance the sale of their Papers, they are welcome; I shall bear it with patience. But they must allow me, with all due humility, to say, that they have wronged me very much, that their strictures were too severe and unmerited; I owe them no ill-will. It requires great talents and greater ill-nature to enter the lists with such consummate writers: I possess neither the one nor the other. I have not the vanity they ascribe to me; the only vanity I acknowledge is to continue to deserve the approbation of the public to my professional exertions. To the Press I owe much; I shall always feel grateful. To the generosity and right feeling which have ever distinguished a British public, I leave the cause of your obliged and humble servant.

East End, Finchley.—June 25, 1822.

JOHN BRAHAM

# ASIATIC DEPARTMENT.

—479—

## Grammatical Distinctions.

To the Editor of the Journal.

SIR,

There is a little point—a very little one it is, yet one would like to see it cleared up by the FRIEND TO BANKES on the principle that men with glass windows should not throw stones.

In his first and altogether original masked attack, he signed himself A FRIEND OF Mr. BANKES. In his subsequent Letters, which were much more cautiously written and rose in eloquence and fury as the danger seemed to diminish, he thought fit to change his signature to A FRIEND TO Mr. BANKES.

It is a misprint I dare say, of course; or perhaps he and his "verum atque decus" friends are of opinion there is no difference between the insignificant particles OF and TO, applied as he applied them, and make not the least doubt they will all stick by one another and say that the Friend to Mr. Bankes never meant to insinuate that he was a friend that of Gentleman, by way of adding greater weight to the already heavy authority of an anonymous Slanderer. In that case it was merely an "innocent imposture" or "literary lie."

NO CRITIC.

## Queries.

### A FEW QUERIES ADDRESSED TO THE FRIEND TO MR. BANKES.

To the Editor of the Journal.

SIR,

Permit me, through the medium of your pages, to ask a few questions, which are connected with the Letter of the FRIEND TO MR. BANKES, in yesterday's BULL.

1st.—With regard to the "STORY of the late Chief Justice;" did the Public confirm or not confirm the sentiments expressed in the CALCUTTA JOURNAL respecting that unhappy business, of which the FRIEND TO BANKES has now kindly thought proper to remind us, in order to serve his own purposes?—I ask any honorable and conscientious man, whether a very great portion of this Society did not countenance and approve of the JOURNAL's opinions, by abstaining from all intercourse with the Family of the Chief Justice during that period to which the FRIEND TO BANKES so feelingly alludes, "Call you this backing of your friends?"

2d.—Did Public feeling coincide or not with the CALCUTTA JOURNAL in the matter of the Vestry Question? Let the FRIEND OF BANKES weave one more false insinuation into the web he has already wrought; and say, if he dare, that it did not!

3d.—Did the BULL start with the intention of rooting that "noxious weed," the CALCUTTA JOURNAL, from the "Flowery Parterre," or did not? Poor BULL! Poor Innocent! Did the JOURNAL attack it\* and did the meek Friend of the injured Bankes take up its cudgels? Cant, cant: it makes an honest man "a weary of the sun," to hear these hypocrites.

I now come to graver matter, but its consideration is worthy of a more powerful pen than mine. I cannot pass it by, however, without demanding from the FRIEND TO MR. BANKES, whom it is that he dares to denominate "dishonest and dishonorable?" Who, Sir!—who is this insolent Slave, that has the presumption to stigmatize with infamy, and brand with disgrace TWO-THIRDS of the King's and Honorable Company's Forces in India; and at least a moiety of the Civil Service of Bengal; for such IS the "Public" of the CALCUTTA JOURNAL† Is it because men cannot agree conscientiously with the FRIEND TO MR. BANKES, that they are to be styled "dishonest

and dishonorable?" Away with such wretched stuff! The FRIEND TO MR. BANKES though "old in devilish spite," is a mere babe in the deep mystery of knowing mankind; for he has yet to learn, what bad men seldom learn, that it is the glorious failing, for so he would probably deem it, of an English heart to feel most warmly for the oppressed, and that Englishmen are neither to be frightened by big words nor cajoled by cunning ones, into a desertion of any cause, until it is proved to be bad, merely because rank, wealth, and authority are arrayed as they always have been arrayed in this miserable country, against it. But the FRIEND TO BANKES is evidently a Tory, which accounts for his mistake.

I am, Sir, and I glory in sharing such a title with TWO-THIRDS of my countrymen in India, with Soldiers and with Statesmen,

ONE OF THOSE SLANDERED BY

Calcutta, Dec. 4, 1822.

"THE FRIEND TO BANKES."

## The Spy System.

To the Editor of the Journal.

SIR,

Being a very quiet man myself, though I do sometimes go into company, and may occasionally do such a thing even as dine at a Grand Jury Dinner (whether as one of the Jurors or one of their Visitors Deponet sayeth not), I beg to protest in my quiet way against the doctrine laid down by the dirty fellow of a Spy, who betrayed the symposiastic secrets of the Convivial Board in the BULL of the 2d instant.

That worthy mouton is pleased to set down every body as joining in the rancorous combination to ruin you, who may be silent on occasions when your conduct, person, family, or principles are made the subject of abuse.

He is wrong, and knows it: There are hundreds in this world like myself who are content with our own calm opinions carefully formed, who are constitutionally averse from public debate and Billingsgate oratory. But what is of far more consequence in this matter: There are many who live in constant dread of Scoundrels and NIGLES that plainly threaten with the vengeance of Government, (have they any authority so to do?) every Civil Servant who will not agree with them, and will not consent to take part in their conspiracies and plots to run down an Individual and Freedom of Discussion together.—A prudent and quiet person like myself is afraid to mix in any debate now-a-days, for fear of the numerous Spies that may report his sentiments so as to do him a mischief. But men may be bullied and intimidated without being convinced, and in this country where we all depend on the favour of Government for advancement, seeming acquiescence is no proof of assent, whether to the bellows of an infuriated BULL, or to the more courtly accents that proceed from assembled Functionaries; or raisers of forced contribution; in such cases a man must consent with as good a grace as he can, and put either his hand or an affront in his pocket. As a modest man, and averse from praise or notice, I am fearful of offending, so I swim with the tide and say nothing, but sit

MUM-CHANCE.

Pray take notice that if you choose to print this, it is at your own risk, and you must neither give up my MS. nor myself to the demands of the very amiable and exalted persons who keep the Proscription List. I have many dependant on me, and can't afford to lose my appointment, or remain where I am, all the days of my life. You won't expect me of course to return your bow if any big wigs are near us, when we meet at the Board of the "Highminded Strangers" and after what the gaunt Russian NIGEL says, I had rather be excused going to the Doo! Doo! Play with you, till we see what footing things are to be on, in the new sera.

\* "Still more recent attack upon the BULL"—Letter from the "Friend to Bankes."

† "I mean not "Mr. Buckingham's Public," I mean the honest and honorable part of society."—Vide Letter.

## Kilopstock's Messiah versified in English.

## BOOK I.—CONTINUED.

Thus Jesus pray'd and rose;—bright in his face  
Beam'd filial love, humility and grace  
Th' Eternal Father with benign delight  
His Son regarded, and from fields of light  
Replied, "my head o'er highest heav'n I rear,  
I stretch my arm o'er boundless space and swear,  
Thro' Thee repentant man I will forgive  
And his sincere, imperfect love receive  
And those whose patience shall endure like thine  
With glory thro' Eternity shall shine."

Thus spoke th' Eternal, and from pole to pole  
All Nature trembling heard the promise roll;  
The infant souls emerging to creation  
Caught with the Light the glad sensation:  
The Guardian Angel fill'd with holy fear  
Shook like the Earth when brooding storms are near;  
Upon their burning thrones the Fiends below  
Trembled, anticipating deeper woe,  
It comes—and down they sink to lower hell,  
Whilst o'er them show'rs of flaming sulphur fell:  
More horrid than dire execration's cries  
Against the Lord and His Anointed rise.

As thus before th' Almighty Father stood  
His Son, Messiah, and successful sued,  
Prostrate in adoration Gabriel lay,  
Amaz'd and rapt in Mercy's new display;  
Ne'er had his Spirit thro' uncounted time  
Glow'd until then with rapture so sublime,  
The mild mysterious grace of God above,  
On earth the great Redeemer's boundless love;  
He rose—adoring stood—with wonder fill'd;  
And as his frame with joy extatic thrill'd  
Bright from his form a sudden splendour flow'd,  
And 'neath his feet the mountain, melting, flow'd

When thus the glory from the Angel broke  
Messiah view'd him, and in mildness spoke,  
"My Guardian Angel veil thy splendor here,  
Remember earth is now our humble sphere,  
Haste in thy glory meet for heav'n alone  
And lay this fond request before the throne,  
That all the prophets and the saints of old  
Who long'd for me, my fullness may behold;  
Since glorying thus my Messenger below,  
Go where thy splendor may undazzling glow."

## Birth.

On the 27th ultimo, the Lady of H. TYLER, Esq. of a Daughter.

## Deaths.

On the 4th instant, at the House of WILLIAM PATRICK, Esq. JOHN TAYLOR, Esq. aged 32 years, deeply regretted by all his Friends.

MR. JAMES SCRATCHLY, (late Foreman of the INDIA GAZETTE Press,) who departed this life on Monday last the 2d of December, after a severe attack of fever of only eight days, which he endured with a singularity of fortitude and Christian resignation, founded on the most pious dependence on the mercies of his Redeemer. His premature death has left his disconsolate widow, child, and a large circle of friends to deplore his irreparable loss.—In contemplating the fate of this excellent young man, cut off in the prime of life, and from the fond attachments of a numerous and heart-broken family, the feebleness of this mortal tenure is fearfully exemplified.—As a son he was remarkable for his filial obedience, as a husband his attachment was unshaken in the midst of diversified circumstances, and as a friend he eminently manifested the good qualities of an affectionate heart. His mild and unassuming deportment attached to him those who have had the pleasure of his acquaintance, and his memory will ever be cherished with poignant feelings of grief.

## Baleful Beacon.

A baleful Beacon Northern Toties fir'd,  
It blaz'd with rancour, and in blood expir'd.—  
Our Eastern Tories now re-lume the flame,  
And bid its rage destroy one hated name;  
Their Victim's blood might quench its fiery glow,  
And blood enough, e'en yet, may freely flow,  
Unless the Law and Public Scorn, in one  
Unite, to frown the miscreant Slanderers down.

## Caution!!!

OYEZ!—OYEZ!—OYEZ!

Whereas it appeareth that Mistress Bull gruddery hath taken down her sign of the MUDDY RED COW, hath discharged *Dun*, and given up business entirely;—And Whereas certain evil-minded persons have congregated together at Public Dinners in the Town, and at Suppers at Dum Dum, convened contrary to the laws of this realm, and have malignly reported that the MUDDY COW and the BLOODY BULL, kept by Master CIVIL NIGGLE and various FRIENDS in joint Partnership, were familiarly concerned with each other,—and have further industriously insinuated that the failure of the former of these Hedge Ale Houses must necessarily involve that of the other:

This is to give notice that there is not, and never was, any degree of connection, familiar or otherwise, between the Cow and the BULL, that the Landlord of the latter has discharged none of his SERVILES or FRIENDS, (some having merely gone to JERASH for a few days to refresh after a hard bout at *Blue Ruin*), and that the Bar of the BULL continues, for the present, (all things in this world being of uncertain duration) as celebrated a BAITING place as ever.

N. B.—The famous JACKOMACACO, so tame and harmless, that he will do personal injury to no one, is exhibited every evening, (Sundays excepted), by Gas-light at the BULL-in-the-HOLE.

GOD SAVE THE KING!

Calcutta,  
December 4, 1822.

ABRAHAM SKEGGS, Town Crier.

## Shipping Departures.

CALCUTTA.			
Date	Names of Vessels	Flags	Commanders
Dec. 3	General Lecor	Portz.	J. G. Duarte
			Destination
			Lisbon

## Stations of Vessels in the River.

CALCUTTA, DECEMBER 2, 1822.

At Diamond Harbour.—H. C. S. ANTELL,—GEORGE THE FOURTH, proceeded down,—GOLCONDA, outward bound, remains,—PROVIDENCE, inward-bound, remains,—NERBODDA, on her way to Town,—LA BELLE ALLIANCE, and MARY ANN SOPHIA, (bark), passed up.

Kedgerree.—His Majesty's Frigate GLASGOW,—JOHANNE MARIA, (D.). GLOUCESTER, and HOMER, (Amer. brig), passed down,—MARY ANN, outward-bound, remains.

New Anchorage.—H. C. Ships PRINCE REGENT, DORSETSHIRE, WARREN HASTINGS, MARCHIONESS OF ELY, and WINCHELSEA.

Saugor.—H. C. Ship ASIA, outward-bound, remains.

## CALCUTTA BAZAR RATES, DECEMBER 2, 1822.

	BUY	SELL
Remittable Loans, .....	Rs. 24 0	23 0
Unremittable ditto, .....	15 12	15 4
Bills of Exchange on the Court of Directors, for 12 Months, dated 31st of December 1821, ....	30 0	29 0
Ditto, for 18 Months dated 30th of April, .....	29 0	28 0
Bank Shares, .....	5500 0	5200 0
Spanish Dollars, per 100, .....	206 0	205 8
Notes of Good Houses, for 6 Months, bearing Interest, at 5 per cent.		
Government Bills, Discount, .....		at 3-8 per cent.
Loans on Deposit of Company's Paper, for 1 to 3 months, at 3-8 per cent.		